arXiv:2112.09871v10 [math.LO] 23 Sep 2023

An ordinal analysis of Π_1-Collection

Toshiyasu Arai
Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences
University of Tokyo
3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8914, JAPAN
tosarai@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Abstract

In this paper we give an ordinal analysis of a set theory with Π_1-Collection.

1 Introduction

In this paper we give an ordinal analysis of a Kripke-Platek set theory with the axiom of Infinity and one of Π_1-Collection, denoted by $\mathsf{KP}\omega + \Pi_1$-Collection. Σ^1_3-DC+BI [Σ^1_3-AC+BI] denotes a second order arithmetic obtained from ACA_0+ BI by adding the axiom of Σ^1_3-Dependent Choice [Σ^1_3-Axiom of Choice], resp. It is easy to see that Σ^1_3-DC+BI is interpreted canonically to the set theory $\mathsf{KP}\omega + \Pi_1$-Collection $+ (V = L)$ with the axiom $V = L$ of constructibility. It is well known that $\Sigma^1_3{-}\mathrm{DC}_0$ implies $\Sigma^1_3{-}\mathrm{AC}$, which yields Δ^1_3-CA, a fortiori Π^1_2-CA, cf. Lemma VII.6.6 of [11]. Moreover it is known that $\Sigma^1_3{-}\mathrm{DC} + \mathrm{BI}$ is Π^1_4-conservative over $\Sigma^1_3{-}\mathrm{AC} + \mathrm{BI}$, and Π^1_4-conservative over $\Delta^1_3{-}\mathrm{CA} + \mathrm{BI}$, cf. Exercise VII.5.13 and Theorem VII.6.16 of [11].

Let σ be a recursively regular ordinal. An ordinal $\alpha < \sigma$ is *stable*[1] in L_σ if $L_\alpha \prec_{\Sigma_1} L_\sigma$ for the constructible universe $L = \bigcup_\alpha L_\alpha$. We see that $(L_\mathbb{I}, \in) \models \mathsf{KP}\omega + \Pi_1$-Collection if $L_\mathbb{I}$ enjoys the $\Delta_0(St)$-collection, where St denotes the predicate for the class $\{\alpha < \mathbb{I} : L_\alpha \prec_{\Sigma_1} L_\mathbb{I}\}$ of stable ordinals in $L_\mathbb{I}$.

The projectum ρ^* of ordinals ρ is the least ordinal $\alpha \leq \rho$ such that there is no injection from ρ into α, which is Σ-definable on L_ρ. An ordinal $\rho > 0$ is said to be *nonprojectible* if $\rho^* = \rho$. For admissible ordinals ρ, ρ is nonprojectible iff L_ρ is a model of the Kripke-Platek set theory $\mathsf{KP}\omega + \Sigma_1$-Separation with the axiom of Σ_1-Separation. For a recursively regular ordinal ρ, ρ is non-projectible iff ρ is a limit of stable ordinals in L_ρ, cf. [3, 7].

We introduce an extension $S_\mathbb{I}$ of $\mathsf{KP}\omega$ in the language $\{\in, St\}$, which codifies $\Sigma(St)$-reflection on stable ordinals. We aim to give an ordinal analysis of the theory $S_\mathbb{I}$.

[1] It is said to be σ-stable in [3, 7].

W. Buchholz [5] analyzed proof-theoretically a set theory $\mathsf{KP}i$ for recursively inaccessible universes through operator controlled derivations. M. Rathjen [10] gives an ordinal analysis of parameter free Π^1_2-Comprehension Axiom. On the other side an ordinal analysis for a set theory $\mathsf{KP}\ell^r + (M \prec_{\Sigma_1} V)$ with a single stable ordinal is given in [2]. To obtain an upper bound of the proof-theoretic ordinal of $S_{\mathbb{I}}$, we follow [5] as follows. An inference rule for $\Sigma(St)$-reflection on stable ordinals is first eliminated from derivations in terms of a collapsing function $\alpha \mapsto \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(\alpha) < \mathbb{I}$. This results in derivations with stable ordinals$< \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(\alpha)$. Then inference rules for stability are replaced by ones for reflections, and the latter are eliminated as in [2].

Thus our proof is similar to ones in [5] for $\mathsf{KP}i$. It seems to us that $\mathsf{KP}\omega + \Pi_1$-Collection is an analogue to $\mathsf{KP}i$ in the next level, or Σ^1_3-DC+BI is an analogue to Σ^1_2-DC+BI, which is equivalent to $\mathsf{KP}i$ proof-theoretically. However there are significant differences between recursive regularity and stability of ordinals. In the former, a limit of recursively regular ordinals need not to be recursively regular, but every limit of stable ordinals is stable. Moreover there is a Δ_0-formula $ad(x)$ such that an ordinal $\alpha > 0$ is recursively regular iff $ad(\alpha)$ holds, though there is a Π_1-formula st such that $\alpha > 0$ is stable in $L_{\mathbb{I}}$ iff $L_{\mathbb{I}} \models st(\alpha)$ for $\alpha < \mathbb{I}$ and recursively regular ordinals $\mathbb{I}$.

In the following theorems, Ω denotes the least recursively regular ordinal ω_1^{CK}, and ψ_Ω a collapsing function such that $\psi_\Omega(\alpha) < \Omega$. $\mathbb{I}$ is an ordinal term denoting an ordinal such that $L_{\mathbb{I}} \models \mathsf{KP}\omega + \Pi_1\text{-Collection} + (V = L)$.

First we show the following Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.1 *Suppose* $\mathsf{KP}\omega + \Pi_1$-Collection $+ (V = L) \vdash \theta$ *for a* Σ_1*-sentence* θ *on* L_Ω*. Then* $L_{\psi_\Omega(\varepsilon_{\mathbb{I}+1})} \models \theta$ *holds.*

It is not hard to see that the ordinal $\psi_\Omega(\varepsilon_{\mathbb{I}+1})$ is computable. Let $<$ denote a computable well-ordering of type $\psi_\Omega(\varepsilon_{\mathbb{I}+1})$ on the set of natural numbers. Conversely we show that Σ^1_3-DC+BI or equivalently Σ^1_3-AC+BI proves that each initial segment of $\psi_\Omega(\varepsilon_{\mathbb{I}+1})$ is well-founded.

Theorem 1.2 Σ^1_3-DC+BI $\vdash Wo[\alpha]$ *for* each $\alpha < \psi_\Omega(\varepsilon_{\mathbb{I}+1})$.

For $T \supset \mathrm{ACA}_0$, $|T|$ denotes the proof-theoretic ordinal of T, i.e., the supremum of order types of computable well-orderings $\prec$ on the set of natural numbers for which T proves the fact that $\prec$ is a well-ordering. Also let $|\mathsf{KP}\omega + \Pi_1\text{-Collection}|_{\Sigma^\Omega_1}$ denote the Σ^Ω_1-ordinal of $\mathsf{KP}\omega + \Pi_1$-Collection, i.e., the ordinal $\min\{\alpha \leq \omega_1^{CK} : \forall \theta \in \Sigma_1 \left(\mathsf{KP}\omega + \Pi_1\text{-Collection} \vdash \theta^{L_\Omega} \Rightarrow L_\alpha \models \theta\right)\}$. We conclude the following theorem, where $\psi_\Omega(\varepsilon_{\mathbb{I}+1})$ denotes the order type of the initial segment $OT(\mathbb{I}) \cap \Omega$ of a notation system $OT(\mathbb{I})$ of ordinals.

Theorem 1.3

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta^1_3\text{-CA+BI}| &= |\Sigma^1_3\text{-AC+BI}| = |\Sigma^1_3\text{-DC+BI}| = |\mathsf{KP}\omega + \Pi_1\text{-Collection}|_{\Sigma^\Omega_1} \\ &= \psi_\Omega(\varepsilon_{\mathbb{I}+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Let us mention the contents of this paper. In the next section 2 a second order arithmetic Σ^1_3-DC+BI is interpreted to a set theory $\mathsf{KP}\omega+\Pi_1$-Collection$+(V=L)$, which is in turn shown to be a subtheory of a set theory $S_{\mathbb{I}}$. In section 3 ordinals for our analysis of Π_1-Collection are introduced, and a computable notation system $OT(\mathbb{I})$ is extracted. In section 4 operator controlled derivations are introduced. In section 5 stable ordinals are eliminated from derivations. Theorem 1.2 is proved in the final sections 6 and 7. Here one maximal distinguished set is needed for each stable ordinal, where a maximal distinguished set is Σ^1_2-definable as in [1]. Σ^1_3-(Dependent) Choice is needed to handle limits of stable ordinals.

IH denotes the Induction Hypothesis, MIH the Main IH, SIH the Subsidiary IH, and SSIH the Sub-Subsidiary IH.

2 Π_1-Collection

In this section a second order arithmetic Σ^1_3-DC+BI is interpreted canonically to a set theory $\mathsf{KP}\omega+\Pi_1$-Collection$+(V=L)$, which is in turn shown to be a subtheory of a set theory $S_{\mathbb{I}}$.

For subsystems of second order arithmetic, we follow largely Simpson's monograph [11]. The subsystem Π^1_1-CA$_0$ for Π^1_1-Comprehension axiom with restricted induction is the strongest one in the big five, and the schema Bar Induction, BI is denoted by TI in [11]. BI allows the transfinite induction schema for well-founded relations.

Σ^1_3-AC+BI denotes a second order arithmetic obtained from Π^1_1-CA$_0$ + BI by adding the axiom Σ^1_3-AC, $\forall n\exists X F(n,X) \to \exists Y\forall n F(n,Y_n)$ for each Π^1_2-formula $F(n,X)$. Σ^1_3-DC+BI denotes a second order arithmetic obtained from Π^1_1-CA$_0$ + BI by adding the axiom Σ^1_3-DC for each Π^1_2-formula $F(n,X,Y)$, $\forall n\forall X\exists Y F(n,X,Y) \to \forall X_0\exists Y\forall n[Y_0 = X_0 \wedge F(n,Y_n,Y_{n+1})]$ with $m \in Y_n \Leftrightarrow (n,m) \in Y$ for a bijective pairing function $(\cdot,\cdot)$. It is easy to see that the formulas F can be Σ^1_3 in the axioms.

The axioms of the set theory $\mathsf{KP}\omega+\Pi_1$-Collection$+(V=L)$ consists of those of $\mathsf{KP}\omega$ (Kripke-Platek set theory with the Axiom of Infinity, cf. [3, 9]) plus the axiom of Constructibility $V=L$, and Π_1-Collection: for each Π_1-formula $A(x,y)$ in the language of set theory, $\forall x\in a\exists y A(x,y) \to \exists b\forall x\in a\exists y\in b A(x,y)$.

Σ_1-Separation denotes the axiom $\exists y\forall x(x\in y \leftrightarrow x\in a\wedge\varphi(x))$ for each Σ_1-formula $\varphi(x)$. Δ_2-Separation denotes the axiom $\forall x\in a(\varphi(x)\leftrightarrow\neg\psi(x)) \to \exists y\forall x(x\in y\leftrightarrow x\in a\wedge\varphi(x))$ for each Σ_2-formulas $\varphi(x)$ and $\psi(x)$.

Σ_2-Replacement denotes the axiom stating that if $\forall x\in a\exists! y\varphi(x,y)$, then there exists a function f with its domain $dom(f)=a$ such that $\forall x\in a\varphi(x,f(x))$ for each Σ_2-formula $\varphi(x,y)$.

Lemma 2.1 $\mathsf{KP}\omega+\Pi_1$-Collection *proves each of* Σ_1-Separation, Δ_2-Separation *and* Σ_2-Replacement.

Proof. We show that $\{x\in a : \varphi(x)\}$ exists as a set for a Σ_1-formula $\varphi \equiv \exists y\theta(x,y)$ with a Δ_0 matrix θ. We have by logic $\forall x\in a\exists y(\exists z\theta(x,z)\to\theta(x,y))$.

By Π_1-Collection pick a set b so that $\forall x \in a \exists y \in b(\varphi(x) \to \theta(x,y))$. In other words, $\{x \in a : \varphi(x)\} = \{x \in a : \exists y \in b\, \theta(x,y)\}$.

Δ_2-Separation follows from Σ_1-Separation as in [3], p.17, Theorem 4.5(Δ Separation), and Σ_2-Replacement follows from Δ_2-Separation as in [3], p.17, Theorem 4.6(Σ Replacement). □

For an ordinal α, L_α denotes the initial segment of Gödel's constructible universe $L = \bigcup_\alpha L_\alpha$. $ad(x)$ designates that x is an admissible set. $<_L$ denotes a canonical Δ_1 well ordering of L, cf. p.162 of [3].

For a formula A in the language of second order arithmetic let A^{set} denote the formula obtained from A by interpreting the first order variable x as $x \in \omega$ and the second order variable X as $X \subset \omega$.

The following is the Quantifier Theorem in p.125 of [9], in which $\mathsf{KP}l^r$ is defined as a set theory for limits of admissible sets with restricted induction.

Lemma 2.2 *For each Σ^{1-}_2-formula $F(n,a,Y)$ without set parameters except Y, there exists a Σ_1-formula $A_\Sigma(n,a,Y)$ in the language of set theory so that for $F_\Sigma(n,a,Y) :\Leftrightarrow \exists d[ad(d) \wedge Y \in d \wedge A^d_\Sigma(n,a,Y)]$,*

$$\mathsf{KP}l^r \vdash n, a \in \omega \wedge Y \subset \omega \to \{F^{set}(n,a,Y) \leftrightarrow F_\Sigma(n,a,Y)\}.$$

Lemma 2.3 *For each sentence A in the language of second order arithmetic,*

$$\Sigma^1_3\text{-DC} + \text{BI} \vdash A \Rightarrow \mathsf{KP}\omega + \Pi_1\text{-Collection} + (V = L) \vdash A^{set}.$$

Proof. By the Quantifier Theorem 2.2 $F^{set}(n,X,Y)$ is equivalent to a Π_1-formula $\varphi(n,X,Y)$ for a Π^1_2-formula $F(n,X,Y)$, $n \in \omega$ and $X \subset \omega$. It suffices to show for a Π_1-formula $\varphi(n,X,Y)$ that assuming $\forall n \in \omega \forall X \subset \omega \exists Y \subset \omega \varphi(n,X,Y)$ and $X_0 \subset \omega$, there exists a function f with its domain $dom(f) = \omega$ such that $\forall n \in \omega[f(0) = X_0 \wedge \varphi(n, f(n), f(n+1))]$. By induction on $k \in \omega$ using $V = L$ we see that there exists a unique family $(Y_n)_{n<k}$ of subsets of ω such that $\forall n < k[\varphi(n, Y_n, Y_{n+1}) \,\&\, \forall Z <_L Y_{n+1} \neg\varphi(n, Y_n, Z)]$. By Σ_2-Replacement pick a function g with $dom(g) = \omega$ and $rng(g) \subset {}^{<\omega}\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ so that for any $k \in \omega$ $g(k)$ is the unique sequence $(Y_n)_{n<k} \in {}^k\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ with $Y_0 = X_0$. Then the function $f(n) = (g(n+1))\,(n)$ is a desired one. □

Next we show that $\mathsf{KP}\omega + \Pi_1$-Collection $+ (V = L)$ is contained in a set theory $S_{\mathbb{I}}$. The language of the theory $S_{\mathbb{I}}$ is $\{\in, St, \Omega\}$ with a unary predicate constant St and an individual constant Ω. $\Delta_0(St)$ denotes the set of bounded formulas in the language $\{\in, St, \Omega\}$, in which atomic formulas $St(t)$ may occur. Similarly $\Sigma_1(St)$ the set of Σ_1-formulas in the expanded language. $St(\alpha)$ is intended to denote the fact that α is a stable ordinal, and Ω is intended to denote the least recursively regular ordinal ω_1^{CK}. The axioms of $S_{\mathbb{I}}$ are obtained from those [2] of $\mathsf{KP}\omega$ by adding the following axioms. Let ON denote the class of all ordinals. For ordinals α, $\alpha^\dagger$ denotes the least stable ordinal above α. A *successor stable*

[2] In the axiom schemata Δ_0-Separation and Δ_0-Collection, Δ_0-formulas remain to mean a Δ_0-formula in which St does not occur, while the axiom of foundation may be applied to a formula in which St may occur.

ordinal is an ordinal $\alpha^\dagger$ for an α. Note that the least stable ordinal $0^\dagger$ is a successor stable ordinal.

1. The axiom $V = L$ of constructibility, and the axioms for recursively regularity of Ω: $\Omega \in ON$, $\omega < \Omega$ and the Δ_0-collection schema on Ω.

2. $\Delta_0(St)$-collection:

$$\forall x \in a \exists y\, \theta(x, y) \to \exists b \forall x \in a \exists y \in b\, \theta(x, y)$$

   for each $\Delta_0(St)$-formula θ in which the predicate St may occurs.

   Note that $\Sigma_1(St)$-collection follows from this.

3. $L = \bigcup\{L_\sigma : St(\sigma)\}$, i.e.,

$$\forall \alpha \in ON \exists \sigma\, (\alpha < \sigma \wedge St(\sigma)) \tag{1}$$

   Let $\alpha^\dagger > \alpha$ denote the least stable ordinal above an ordinal α.

4. For a successor stable ordinal $\sigma < \mathbb{I}$, $L_\sigma \prec_{\Sigma_1} L$:

$$SSt(\sigma) \wedge \varphi(u) \wedge u \in L_\sigma \to \varphi^{L_\sigma}(u) \tag{2}$$

   for each Σ_1-formula φ in the language of set theory, i.e., the constant St does not occur in φ.

Lemma 2.4 *$S_{\mathbb{I}}$ is an extension of* $\mathsf{KP}\omega + \Pi_1$-Collection $+ (V = L)$. *Namely $S_{\mathbb{I}}$ proves* Π_1-Collection.

Proof. Argue in $S_{\mathbb{I}}$. Let $A(x, y)$ be a Π_1-formula in the language of set theory. We obtain by the axioms (1) and (2)

$$A(x, y) \leftrightarrow \exists \beta (St(\beta^\dagger) \wedge x, y \in L_{\beta^\dagger} \wedge A^{L_{\beta^\dagger}}(x, y)) \tag{3}$$

Assume $\forall x \in a \exists y A(x, y)$. Then we obtain $\forall x \in a \exists y \exists \beta (St(\beta^\dagger) \wedge x, y \in L_{\beta^\dagger} \wedge A^{L_{\beta^\dagger}}(x, y))$ by (3). Since $St(\beta^\dagger) \wedge x, y \in L_{\beta^\dagger} \wedge A^{L_{\beta^\dagger}}(x, y)$ is a $\Sigma_1(St)$-formula, pick a set c such that $\forall x \in a \exists y \in c \exists \beta \in c (St(\beta^\dagger) \wedge x, y \in L_{\beta^\dagger} \wedge A^{L_{\beta^\dagger}}(x, y))$ by $\Delta_0(St)$-Collection. Again by (3) we obtain $\forall x \in a \exists y \in c A(x, y)$. □

3 Ordinals for Π_1-Collection

In this section up to subsection 3.1 we work in a set theory $\mathsf{ZFC}(St)$, where St is a unary predicate symbol. $\Omega < \mathbb{I}$ are strongly critical numbers, i.e., ordinals> 0 which are closed under the binary Veblen function $\varphi\alpha\beta = \varphi_\alpha(\beta)$. We assume that St is an unbounded class of uncountable cardinals below $\mathbb{I}$ such that the least element $\mathbb{S}_0$ of St is larger than Ω, $\Omega < \mathbb{S}_0 = \min St$. The predicate is identified with the class $\{\alpha \in ON : \alpha \in St\}$. $\alpha^\dagger$ denotes the least ordinal$> \alpha$ in the class St when $\alpha < \mathbb{I}$. $\alpha^\dagger := \mathbb{I}$ if $\alpha \geq \mathbb{I}$. Then $\mathbb{S}_0 = \Omega^\dagger$. Let

$SSt := \{\alpha^\dagger : \alpha \in ON\}$ and $LS = St \setminus SSt$. For natural numbers k, $\alpha^{\dagger k}$ is defined recursively by $\alpha^{\dagger 0} = \alpha$ and $\alpha^{\dagger(k+1)} = (\alpha^{\dagger k})^\dagger$. For $\mathbb{S} \in St$, let $\mathbb{S}^{-\dagger} := \mathbb{T}$ if $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{T}^\dagger$ for a $\mathbb{T} \in St$. Otherwise $\mathbb{S}^{-\dagger} := \mathbb{S}$.

$\alpha > 0$ is a strongly critical number if $\forall b, \xi < \alpha(\varphi_b(\xi) < \alpha)$. For ordinals α, $\varepsilon(\alpha)$ denotes the least epsilon number above α,. For ordinals α, β, and γ, $\gamma = \alpha - \beta$ designates that $\alpha = \beta + \gamma$. $\alpha \dot{+} \beta$ denotes the sum $\alpha + \beta$ when $\alpha + \beta$ equals to the commutative (natural) sum $\alpha \# \beta$, i.e., when either $\alpha = 0$ or $\alpha = \alpha_0 + \omega^{\alpha_1}$ with $\omega^{\alpha_1+1} > \beta$.

$u, v, w, x, y, z, \ldots$ range over sets in the universe, $a, b, c, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \ldots$ range over ordinals$< \varepsilon(\mathbb{I})$, and $\xi, \zeta, \eta, \ldots$ range over ordinals$< \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$, and $\pi, \kappa, \rho, \sigma, \tau, \lambda, \ldots$ range over ordinals$\leq \mathbb{I}$.

Let $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$. A 'Mahlo degree' $m(\pi)$ of ordinals $\pi < \mathbb{S}$ with higher reflections is defined to be a finite function $f : \mathbb{I} \to \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$. Let $\Lambda \leq \mathbb{I}$ be a strongly critical number. To denote ordinals$< \varphi_\Lambda(0)$, it is convenient for us to introduce an ordinal function $\tilde{\theta}_b(\xi; \Lambda) < \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$, $\xi < \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ and $b < \Lambda$ as in [2], which is a b-th iterate of the exponential $\tilde{\theta}_1(\xi; \Lambda) = \Lambda^\xi$ with the base Λ.

Definition 3.1 Let $\Lambda \leq \mathbb{I}$ be a strongly critical number. $\varphi_b(\xi)$ denotes the binary Veblen function on $\mathbb{I}^+ = \omega_{\mathbb{I}+1}$ with $\varphi_0(\xi) = \omega^\xi$, and $\tilde{\varphi}_b(\xi; \Lambda) := \varphi_b(\Lambda \cdot \xi)$.

Let $b, \xi < \mathbb{I}^+$. $\theta_b(\xi)$ $[\tilde{\theta}_b(\xi; \Lambda)]$ denotes a b-th iterate of $\varphi_0(\xi) = \omega^\xi$ [of $\tilde{\varphi}_0(\xi; \Lambda) = \Lambda^\xi$], resp. Specifically ordinals $\theta_b(\xi), \tilde{\theta}_b(\xi; \Lambda) < \mathbb{I}^+$ are defined by recursion on b as follows. $\theta_0(\xi) = \tilde{\theta}_0(\xi; \Lambda) = \xi$, $\theta_{\omega^b}(\xi) = \varphi_b(\xi)$, $\tilde{\theta}_{\omega^b}(\xi; \Lambda) = \tilde{\varphi}_b(\xi; \Lambda)$, and $\theta_{c \dot{+} \omega^b}(\xi) = \theta_c(\theta_{\omega^b}(\xi))$ $\tilde{\theta}_{c \dot{+} \omega^b}(\xi; \Lambda) = \tilde{\theta}_c(\tilde{\theta}_{\omega^b}(\xi; \Lambda); \Lambda)$.

Let us define a normal form of non-zero ordinals $\xi < \varphi_\Lambda(0)$. Let $\xi = \Lambda^\zeta$. If $\zeta < \Lambda^\zeta$, then $\tilde{\theta}_1(\zeta; \Lambda)$ is the normal form of ξ, denoted by $\xi =_{NF} \tilde{\theta}_1(\zeta; \Lambda)$. Assume $\zeta = \Lambda^\zeta$, and let $b > 0$ be the maximal ordinal such that there exists an ordinal η with $\zeta = \tilde{\varphi}_b(\eta; \Lambda) > \eta$. Then $\xi = \tilde{\varphi}_b(\eta; \Lambda) =_{NF} \tilde{\theta}_{\omega^b}(\eta; \Lambda)$.

Let $\xi = \Lambda^{\zeta_m} a_m + \cdots + \Lambda^{\zeta_0} a_0$, where $\zeta_m > \cdots > \zeta_0$ and $0 \leq a_0, \ldots, a_m < \Lambda$. Let $\Lambda^{\zeta_i} =_{NF} \tilde{\theta}_{b_i}(\eta_i; \Lambda)$ with $b_i = \omega^{c_i}$ for each i. Then $\xi =_{NF} \tilde{\theta}_{b_m}(\eta_m; \Lambda) \cdot a_m + \cdots + \tilde{\theta}_{b_0}(\eta_0; \Lambda) \cdot a_0$.

Definition 3.2 Let $\xi < \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ be a non-zero ordinal with its normal form:

$$\xi = \sum_{i \leq m} \tilde{\theta}_{b_i}(\xi_i; \Lambda) \cdot a_i =_{NF} \tilde{\theta}_{b_m}(\xi_m; \Lambda) \cdot a_m + \cdots + \tilde{\theta}_{b_0}(\xi_0; \Lambda) \cdot a_0 \qquad (4)$$

where $\tilde{\theta}_{b_i}(\xi_i; \Lambda) > \xi_i$, $\tilde{\theta}_{b_m}(\xi_m; \Lambda) > \cdots > \tilde{\theta}_{b_0}(\xi_0; \Lambda)$, $b_i = \omega^{c_i} < \Lambda$, and $0 < a_0, \ldots, a_m < \Lambda$. $\tilde{\theta}_{b_0}(\xi_0; \Lambda)$ is said to be the *tail* of ξ, denoted $\tilde{\theta}_{b_0}(\xi_0; \Lambda) = tl(\xi)$, and $\tilde{\theta}_{b_m}(\xi_m; \Lambda)$ the *head* of ξ, denoted $\tilde{\theta}_{b_m}(\xi_m; \Lambda) = hd(\xi)$.

Let $SC_\Lambda(\xi) := \bigcup_{i \leq m} (\{a_i, b_i\} \cup SC_\Lambda(\xi_i))$.

1. ζ is a *part* of ξ iff there exists an n $(0 \leq n \leq m+1)$ such that $\zeta =_{NF} \sum_{i \geq n} \tilde{\theta}_{b_i}(\xi_i; \Lambda) \cdot a_i = \tilde{\theta}_{b_m}(\xi_m; \Lambda) \cdot a_m + \cdots + \tilde{\theta}_{b_n}(\xi_n; \Lambda) \cdot a_n$ for ξ in (4).

2. Let $\zeta =_{NF} \tilde{\theta}_b(\xi; \Lambda)$ with $\tilde{\theta}_b(\xi; \Lambda) > \xi$ and $b = \omega^{b_0}$, and c be ordinals. An ordinal $\tilde{\theta}_{-c}(\zeta)$ is defined recursively as follows. If $b \geq c$, then $\tilde{\theta}_{-c}(\zeta) =$

$\tilde{\theta}_{b-c}(\xi;\Lambda)$. Let $c > b$. If $\xi > 0$, then $\tilde{\theta}_{-c}(\zeta) = \tilde{\theta}_{-(c-b)}(\tilde{\theta}_{b_m}(\xi_m;\Lambda))$ for the head term $hd(\xi) = \tilde{\theta}_{b_m}(\xi_m;\Lambda)$ of ξ in (4). If $\xi = 0$, then let $\tilde{\theta}_{-c}(\zeta) = 0$.

3. Let $\xi < \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ be such that $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\xi) \subset \Lambda$ for a strongly critical number $\Lambda < \mathbb{I}$. Then $\xi[\Lambda/\mathbb{I}]$ denotes an ordinal$< \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ obtained from ξ by changing the base $\mathbb{I}$ to Λ. This means that $\xi[\Lambda : \mathbb{I}]$ is obtained from ξ in (4) by replacing $\theta_{b_i}(\xi_i;\mathbb{I}) \cdot a_i$ by $\theta_{b_i}(\xi_i[\Lambda : \mathbb{I}];\Lambda) \cdot a_i$.

Proposition 3.3 *Let $\xi, \zeta < \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ be such that $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\xi) \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\zeta) \subset \Lambda$ for a strongly critical number $\Lambda < \mathbb{I}$. Then $\xi < \zeta$ iff $\xi[\Lambda : \mathbb{I}] < \zeta[\Lambda : \mathbb{I}]$.*

Definition 3.4 Let $\Lambda \leq \mathbb{I}$ be a strongly critical number.

1. A function $f : \Lambda \to \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ with a *finite* support $\mathrm{supp}(f) = \{c < \Lambda : f(c) \neq 0\} \subset \Lambda$ is said to be a *finite function* with *base* Λ if $\forall i > 0(a_i = 1)$ and $a_0 = 1$ when $b_0 > 1$ in $f(c) =_{NF} \tilde{\theta}_{b_m}(\xi_m;\Lambda) \cdot a_m + \cdots + \tilde{\theta}_{b_0}(\xi_0;\Lambda) \cdot a_0$ for any $c \in \mathrm{supp}(f)$.

   It is identified with the finite function $f \restriction \mathrm{supp}(f)$. When $c \notin \mathrm{supp}(f)$, let $f(c) := 0$. $f, g, h, \ldots$ range over finite functions.

   Let $SC_\Lambda(f) := \bigcup\{\{c\} \cup SC_\Lambda(f(c)) : c \in \mathrm{supp}(f)\}$.

   For an ordinal c, f_c and f^c are restrictions of f to the domains $\mathrm{supp}(f_c) = \{d \in \mathrm{supp}(f) : d < c\}$ and $\mathrm{supp}(f^c) = \{d \in \mathrm{supp}(f) : d \geq c\}$. $g_c * f^c$ denotes the concatenated function such that $\mathrm{supp}(g_c * f^c) = \mathrm{supp}(g_c) \cup \mathrm{supp}(f^c)$, $(g_c * f^c)(a) = g(a)$ for $a < c$, and $(g_c * f^c)(a) = f(a)$ for $a \geq c$.

2. Let $f : \mathbb{I} \to \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ be a finite function with base $\mathbb{I}$ and $\Lambda < \mathbb{I}$ a strongly critical number such that $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \Lambda$. Then $g = f[\Lambda : \mathbb{I}] : \Lambda \to \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ denotes a finite function with base Λ such that $g(c) = (f(c))[\Lambda : \mathbb{I}]$ for every $c \in \mathrm{supp}(g) = \mathrm{supp}(f)$, where $(f(c))[\Lambda : \mathbb{I}]$ denotes the ordinal in Definition 3.2.3.

3. Let f be a finite function, $c < \Lambda$ and $\xi < \varphi_\Lambda(0)$. A relation $f <^c_\Lambda \xi$ is defined by induction on the cardinality of the finite set $\{d \in \mathrm{supp}(f) : d > c\}$ as follows. If $f^c = \emptyset$, then $f <^c_\Lambda \xi$ holds. For $f^c \neq \emptyset$, $f <^c_\Lambda \xi$ iff there exists a part μ of ξ such that $f(c) < \mu$ and $f <^{c+d}_\Lambda \tilde{\theta}_{-d}(tl(\mu))$ for $d = \min\{c + d \in \mathrm{supp}(f) : d > 0\}$, where parts of $\mu < \varphi_\Lambda(0)$, the tail $tl(\mu)$ and $\tilde{\theta}_{-d}(\mu)$ are defined from the function $\tilde{\theta}_b(\xi;\Lambda)$ with base Λ in Definition 3.2.

We see the following Proposition 3.5 as in [1, 2].

Proposition 3.5 *For a finite function f with base Λ, $f <^c_\Lambda \xi \leq \zeta \Rightarrow f <^c_\Lambda \zeta$.*

Definition 3.6 Let $A \subset \mathbb{I}$ be a set, and $\alpha \leq \mathbb{I}$ a limit ordinal.

$\alpha \in M(A) :\Leftrightarrow A \cap \alpha$ is stationary in $\alpha \Leftrightarrow$ every club subset of α meets A.

In the following Definition 3.7, $\varphi\alpha\beta = \varphi_\alpha(\beta)$ denotes the binary Veblen function on $\mathbb{I}^+$, and $\mathbb{S}_0 := \Omega^\dagger$ the least ordinal in the class St. For $a < \varepsilon(\mathbb{I})$, $c < \mathbb{I}$, $\xi < \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$, and $\Theta \subset_{fin} \mathbb{I}$, define simultaneously classes $\mathcal{H}_a(X) \subset \Gamma_{\mathbb{I}+1}$, $Mh^a_c(\xi) \subset (\mathbb{I}+1)$, and ordinals $\psi^f_\kappa(a) \leq \kappa$ by recursion on ordinals a as follows.

Definition 3.7 Let $\mathcal{H}_a[Y](X) := \mathcal{H}_a(Y \cup X)$ for $X, Y \subset \Gamma_{\mathbb{I}+1}$ and $a < \varepsilon(\mathbb{I})$.

1. (Inductive definition of $\mathcal{H}_a(X)$)
   (a) $\{0, \Omega, \mathbb{I}\} \cup X \subset \mathcal{H}_a(X)$.
   (b) If $x, y \in \mathcal{H}_a(X)$, then $x + y \in \mathcal{H}_a(X)$, and $\varphi xy \in \mathcal{H}_a(X)$.
   (c) Let $\alpha = \psi_\Omega(b)$ with $b \in \mathcal{H}_a(X) \cap a$. Then $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_a(X)$.
   (d) Let $\alpha = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)$ with $b \in \mathcal{H}_a(X) \cap a$. Then $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_a(X) \cap (LS \cup \{\mathbb{I}\})$.
   (e) Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_a(X) \cap \mathbb{I}$. Then $\alpha^\dagger \in \mathcal{H}_a(X) \cap SSt$.
   (f) Let $\alpha = \psi^f_\pi(b)$, where $b < a$, and a finite function $f : \mathbb{I} \to \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ such that $\{\pi, b\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(X) \cap \mathcal{H}_b(\alpha)$.
   Then $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_a(X)$.

2. (Definitions of $Mh^a_c(\xi)$ and $Mh^a_c(f)$)
   The classes $Mh^a_c(\xi)$ are defined for $c < \mathbb{I}$, ordinals $a < \varepsilon(\mathbb{I})$ and $\xi < \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$. By main induction on ordinals $\pi < \mathbb{I}$ with subsidiary induction on $c < \mathbb{I}$ we define $\pi \in Mh^a_c(\xi)$ iff $\{a, c, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi)$ and the following condition is met for any finite functions $f, g : \mathbb{I} \to \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ such that $f <^c_{\mathbb{I}} \xi$

$$SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f, g) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi) \,\&\, \pi \in Mh^a_0(g_c) \Rightarrow \pi \in M(Mh^a_0(g_c * f^c))$$

   where

$$\begin{aligned} Mh^a_c(f) &:= \bigcap\{Mh^a_d(f(d)) : d \in \mathrm{supp}(f^c)\} \\ &= \bigcap\{Mh^a_d(f(d)) : c \leq d \in \mathrm{supp}(f)\} \end{aligned}$$

3. (Definition of $\psi^f_\pi(a)$)
   Let a, π ordinals with $\Omega < \pi < \mathbb{I}$, and $f : \mathbb{I} \to \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ a finite function. Then $\psi^f_\pi(a)$ denotes the least ordinal $\kappa < \pi$ such that

$$\kappa \in Mh^a_0(f) \,\&\, \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \pi \subset \kappa \,\&\, \{\pi, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \tag{5}$$

   if such a κ exists. Otherwise set $\psi^f_\pi(a) = \pi$.
   For the empty function $\emptyset$, $\psi_\pi(a) := \psi^\emptyset_\pi(a)$ with the set $Mh^a_c(\emptyset)$ of uncountable cardinals.

4. $\psi_\Omega(a) := \min(\{\Omega\} \cup \{\beta < \Omega : \mathcal{H}_a(\beta) \cap \Omega \subset \beta\})$ and

$$\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(a) := \min(\{\mathbb{I}\} \cup \{\kappa \in LS : \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \mathbb{I} \subset \kappa\}) \tag{6}$$

5. For classes $A \subset \mathbb{I}$, let $\alpha \in M_c^a(A)$ iff $\alpha \in A$ and for any finite functions $g : \mathbb{I} \to \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$

$$\alpha \in Mh_0^a(g_c) \,\&\, SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g_c) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha \in M\,(Mh_0^a(g_c) \cap A) \qquad (7)$$

Proposition 3.8 *Each of $x \in \mathcal{H}_a(y)$, $x \in Mh_c^a(f)$ and $x = \psi_\kappa^f(a)$ is a $\Delta_1(St)$-predicate in $\mathsf{ZFC}(St)$.*

3.1 A small large cardinal hypothesis

It is convenient for us to assume the existence of a small large cardinal in justification of Definition 3.7.

Shrewd cardinals are introduced by M. Rathjen [10]. Let $\eta > 0$. A cardinal κ is *η-shrewd* iff for any $P \subset V_\kappa$, and a formula $\varphi(x, y)$ if $V_{\kappa+\eta} \models \varphi[P, \kappa]$, then there are $0 < \kappa_0, \eta_0 < \kappa$ such that $V_{\kappa_0+\eta_0} \models \varphi[P \cap V_{\kappa_0}, \kappa_0]$. We see easily that each η-shrewd cardinal is regular. A cardinal κ is said to be *shrewd* in V_η if κ is δ-shrewd for every $\delta < \eta$.

On the other side subtle cardinals are introduced by R. Jensen and K. Kunen, cf. [6]. It is shown in Lemma 2.7 of [10] that the set of shrewd cardinals in V_π is stationary in a subtle cardinal π. From this fact we see that the set of shrewd limits of shrewd cardinals in V_π is also stationary in a subtle cardinal π, where for a shrewd cardinal κ in V_π, κ is a shrewd limit iff κ is a limit of shrewd cardinals in V_π.

In this subsection we work in an extension T of ZFC by adding the axiom stating that there exists a regular cardinal $\mathbb{I}$ such that the set St of shrewd cardinals in $V_{\mathbb{I}}$ is stationary in $\mathbb{I}$. In this subsection Ω denotes the least uncountable ordinal ω_1, and LS denotes the set of shrewd limits in $V_{\mathbb{I}}$. The class LS is stationary in $\mathbb{I}$. A *successor shrewd cardinal* is a shrewd cardinal in $V_{\mathbb{I}}$, not in LS.

Lemma 3.9 $\forall a[\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(a) < \mathbb{I}]$.

Proof. The set $C = \{\kappa < \mathbb{I} : \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \mathbb{I} \subset \kappa\}$ is a club subset of the regular cardinal $\mathbb{I}$. This shows the existence of a $\kappa \in LS \cap C$, and hence $\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(a) < \mathbb{I}$ by the definition (6). □

Proposition 3.10 *Let $a \in \mathcal{H}_a(\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(a))$, $b \in \mathcal{H}_b(\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b))$, $c \in \mathcal{H}_c(\psi_\Omega(c))$ and $d \in \mathcal{H}_d(\psi_\Omega(d))$.*

1. *$\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(a) < \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)$ iff $a < b$.*
2. *$\Omega^{\dagger k} < \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)$ for every $k < \omega$.*
3. *Let $\alpha = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(a)$ and $0 < k < \omega$. Then $\alpha^{\dagger k} < \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)$ iff $\alpha < \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)$. $\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b) < \alpha^{\dagger k}$ iff $\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b) \leq \alpha$.*
4. *$\psi_\Omega(c) < \psi_\Omega(d)$ iff $c < d$.*

Proof. 3.10.2 and 3.10.3. Let $\beta = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)$. By the definition (6) and $\Omega \in \mathcal{H}_b(\beta) \cap \mathbb{I} \subset \beta$ we obtain $\Omega < \beta$. Let $\alpha \in \{\Omega, \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(a)\}$. If $\alpha < \beta$, then $\beta \in LS$ yields $\alpha^{\dagger k} < \beta$. □

Lemma 3.11 *Let $\mathbb{S}$ be a shrewd cardinal, $a < \varepsilon(\mathbb{I})$, $h : \mathbb{I} \to \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ a finite function with $\{a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(h) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$. Then $\mathbb{S} \in Mh^a_0(h) \cap M(Mh^a_0(h))$.*

Proof. By induction on $\xi < \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ we show $\mathbb{S} \in Mh^a_c(\xi)$ for $\{a, c, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$.

Let $\{a, c, \xi\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$ with $f <^c_{\mathbb{I}} \xi$ and $a < \varepsilon(\mathbb{I})$. We show $\mathbb{S} \in M^a_c(Mh^a_c(f^c))$, which yields $\mathbb{S} \in Mh^a_c(\xi)$. IH yields $\mathbb{S} \in Mh^a_c(f^c)$ by $\tilde{\theta}_{-e}(\zeta) \leq \zeta$, where $\tilde{\theta}_{-e}(\zeta)$ is defined from $\tilde{\theta}(\alpha; \mathbb{I})$. By the definition (7) it suffices to show that $\forall g[\mathbb{S} \in Mh^a_0(g_c) \,\&\, SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g_c) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S}) \Rightarrow \mathbb{S} \in M\,(Mh^a_0(g_c) \cap Mh^a_c(f^c))]$.

Let $g : \mathbb{I} \to \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ be a finite function such that $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g_c) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$ and $\mathbb{S} \in Mh^a_0(g_c)$. We have to show $\mathbb{S} \in M(A \cap B)$ for $A = Mh^a_0(g_c) \cap \mathbb{S}$ and $B = Mh^a_c(f^c) \cap \mathbb{S}$. Let C be a club subset of $\mathbb{S}$.

We have $\mathbb{S} \in Mh^a_0(g_c) \cap Mh^a_c(f^c)$, and $\{a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g_c, f^c) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$. Pick a $b < \mathbb{S}$ so that $\{a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g_c, f^c) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(b)$. Since the cardinality of the set $\mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$ is equal to $\mathbb{S}$, pick a bijection $F : \mathbb{S} \to \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$. Each $\alpha < \Gamma_{\mathbb{I}+1}$ with $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$ is identified with its code, denoted by $F^{-1}(\alpha)$. Let P be the class $P = \{(\pi, d, \alpha) \in \mathbb{S}^3 : \pi \in Mh^{F(\alpha)}_{F(d)}(F(\xi))\}$, where $F(d) \in \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S}) \cap (c+1)$ and $F(\alpha) < \Gamma_{\mathbb{I}+1}$ with $\{F(d), F(\alpha)\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi)$. For fixed a and c, the set $\{(d, \zeta) \in (\mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S}) \cap (c+1)) \times \Gamma_{\mathbb{I}+1} : \mathbb{S} \in Mh^a_d(\zeta)\}$ is defined from the class P by recursion on ordinals $d \leq c$.

Let φ be a formula such that $V_{\mathbb{S}+c^\dagger} \models \varphi[P, C, \mathbb{S}, b]$ iff $\mathbb{S} \in Mh^a_0(g_c) \cap Mh^a_c(f^c)$ and C is a club subset of $\mathbb{S}$. Since $\mathbb{S}$ is shrewd in $V_{\mathbb{I}}$, pick $b < \mathbb{S}_0 < \eta < \mathbb{S}$ such that $V_{\mathbb{S}_0+\eta} \models \varphi[P \cap \mathbb{S}_0, C \cap \mathbb{S}_0, \mathbb{S}_0, b]$. We obtain $\mathbb{S}_0 \in A \cap B \cap C$.

Therefore $\mathbb{S} \in Mh^a_c(\xi)$ is shown for every $\{c, \xi\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$. This yields $\mathbb{S} \in Mh^a_0(h)$ for $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(h) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$. $\mathbb{S} \in M(Mh^a_0(h))$ follows from the shrewdness of $\mathbb{S}$. □

Lemma 3.12 *Let $\mathbb{S}$ be a shrewd cardinal, a an ordinal, and $f : \mathbb{I} \to \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ a finite function such that $\{a, \mathbb{S}\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$. Then $\psi^f_{\mathbb{S}}(a) < \mathbb{S}$ holds.*

Proof. Suppose $\{a, \mathbb{S}\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$. By Lemma 3.11 we obtain $\mathbb{S} \in M(Mh^a_0(f))$. The set $C = \{\kappa < \mathbb{S} : \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \mathbb{S} \subset \kappa, \{a, \mathbb{S}\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa)\}$ is a club subset of the regular cardinal $\mathbb{S}$, and $Mh^a_0(f)$ is stationary in $\mathbb{S}$. This shows the existence of a $\kappa \in Mh^a_0(f) \cap C \cap \mathbb{S}$, and hence $\psi^f_{\mathbb{S}}(a) < \mathbb{S}$ by the definition (5). □

Proposition 3.13 *Let α be either Ω or a shrewd cardinal, and $\mathbb{S} = \alpha^\dagger$. Assume $\{a, \mathbb{S}\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\mathbb{S})$ for an ordinal a and a finite function $f : \mathbb{I} \to \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$. Then $\alpha < \psi^f_{\mathbb{S}}(a)$, and $\psi^f_{\mathbb{S}}(a) \notin St$.*

Proof. Let $\kappa = \psi^f_{\mathbb{S}}(a) < \mathbb{S}$. We obtain $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa)$ by $\alpha^\dagger = \mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa)$. $\alpha < \kappa$ is seen from $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_a(\kappa) \cap \mathbb{S} \subset \kappa$ in the definition (5). □

The following Corollary 3.15 is seen as in [2].

Definition 3.14 For finite functions $f, g : \mathbb{I} \to \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$, define $Mh_0^a(g) \prec Mh_0^a(f)$ iff $\forall \pi \in Mh_0^a(f)\,(SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi) \Rightarrow \pi \in M(Mh_0^a(g)))$.

Corollary 3.15 *Let $f, g : \mathbb{I} \to \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ be finite functions and $c \in \mathrm{supp}(f)$. Assume that there exists an ordinal $d < c$ such that $(d, c) \cap \mathrm{supp}(f) = (d, c) \cap \mathrm{supp}(g) = \emptyset$, $g_d = f_d$, $g(d) < f(d) + \tilde{\theta}_{c-d}(f(c); \mathbb{I}) \cdot \omega$, and $g <_{\mathbb{I}}^c f(c)$.*

Then $Mh_0^a(g) \prec Mh_0^a(f)$ holds. In particular if $\pi \in Mh_0^a(f)$ and $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\pi)$, then $\psi_\pi^g(a) < \pi$.

Definition 3.16 Let $\Lambda \leq \mathbb{I}$ be a strongly critical number. An *irreducibility* of finite functions $f : \Lambda \to \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ with base Λ is defined by induction on the cardinality n of the finite set $\mathrm{supp}(f)$. If $n \leq 1$, f is defined to be irreducible. Let $n \geq 2$ and $c < c + d$ be the largest two elements in $\mathrm{supp}(f)$, and let g be a finite function such that $\mathrm{supp}(g) = \mathrm{supp}(f_c) \cup \{c\}$, $g_c = f_c$ and $g(c) = f(c) + \tilde{\theta}_d(f(c + d); \Lambda)$.

Then f is irreducible iff $tl(f(c)) > \tilde{\theta}_d(f(c + d); \Lambda)$ and g is irreducible.

For an irreducible function $f : \mathbb{I} \to \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ with base $\mathbb{I}$, we see that $f[\Lambda : \mathbb{I}] : \Lambda \to \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ is an irreducible function with base Λ, where $f[\Lambda : \mathbb{I}]$ denotes the function in Definition 3.4.2.

Definition 3.17 Let $f, g : \Lambda \to \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ be irreducible finite functions with base Λ, and b an ordinal. Let us define a relation $f <_{lx}^b g$ by induction on the cardinality $\#\{e \in \mathrm{supp}(f) \cup \mathrm{supp}(g) : e \geq b\}$ as follows. $f <_{lx}^b g$ holds iff $f^b \neq g^b$ and for the ordinal $c = \min\{c \geq b : f(c) \neq g(c)\}$, one of the following conditions is met:

1. $f(c) < g(c)$ and let μ be the shortest part of $g(c)$ such that $f(c) < \mu$. Then for any $c < c + d \in \mathrm{supp}(f)$, if $tl(\mu) \leq \tilde{\theta}_d(f(c + d); \Lambda)$, then $f <_{lx}^{c+d} g$ holds.

2. $f(c) > g(c)$ and let ν be the shortest part of $f(c)$ such that $\nu > g(c)$. Then there exist a $c < c + d \in \mathrm{supp}(g)$ such that $f <_{lx}^{c+d} g$ and $tl(\nu) \leq \tilde{\theta}_d(g(c + d); \Lambda)$.

In [1] the following Proposition 3.18 is shown.

Proposition 3.18 *Let $f, g : \mathbb{I} \to \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$. If $f <_{lx}^0 g$, then $Mh_0^a(f) \prec Mh_0^a(g)$.*

Proposition 3.19 *Let $f, g : \mathbb{I} \to \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ and $\Lambda < \mathbb{I}$ be a strongly critical number such that $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \subset \Lambda$. Then $f <_{lx}^0 g$ iff $f[\Lambda : \mathbb{I}] <_{lx}^0 g[\Lambda : \mathbb{I}]$, where $f[\Lambda : \mathbb{I}]$ is a finite function with base Λ in Definition 3.4.2.*

Proposition 3.20 *Let $f, g : \mathbb{I} \to \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ be irreducible functions, and assume that $\psi_\pi^f(b) < \pi$ and $\psi_\kappa^g(a) < \kappa$.*

Then $\psi_\pi^f(b) < \psi_\kappa^g(a)$ iff one of the following cases holds:

1. $\pi \leq \psi_\kappa^g(a)$.

2. $b < a$, $\psi^f_\pi(b) < \kappa$, *and* $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \cup \{\pi, b\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\psi^g_\kappa(a))$.

3. $b > a$, *and* $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \cup \{\kappa, a\} \not\subset \mathcal{H}_b(\psi^f_\pi(b))$.

4. $b = a$, $\kappa < \pi$, *and* $\kappa \notin \mathcal{H}_b(\psi^f_\pi(b))$.

5. $b = a$, $\pi = \kappa$, $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\psi^g_\kappa(a))$, *and* $f <^0_{lx} g$.

6. $b = a$, $\pi = \kappa$, $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \not\subset \mathcal{H}_b(\psi^f_\pi(b))$.

Proof. This is seen from Proposition 3.18 as in [2]. □

3.2 A computable notation system for Π_1-collection

Although Propositions 3.10, 3.13, and 3.20 suffice for us to define a computable notation system for $\mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon(\mathbb{I})}(0)$, we need a notation system closed under Mostowski collapsings to remove stable ordinals from derivations as in [2], cf. section 4. A new constructor $\mathbb{I}[\cdot]$ is used to generate terms in $OT(\mathbb{I})$.

Definition 3.21 $\{(\rho, \sigma) : \rho \prec \sigma\}$ denotes the transitive closure of the relation $\{(\rho, \sigma) : \exists f, a(\rho = \psi^f_\sigma(a))\}$. Let $\rho \preceq \sigma :\Leftrightarrow \rho \prec \sigma \vee \rho = \sigma$.

Let $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$ and $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$. We define a set $M_\rho = \mathcal{H}_b(\rho)$ from ρ in (8) in such a way that $\mathcal{H}_b(\rho) \cap \mathbb{S} \subset \rho$. Then a Mostowski collapsing $M_\rho \ni \alpha \mapsto \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ in Definition 3.24 maps ordinal terms $\alpha \in M_\rho$ to $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] < \mathbb{S}$ isomorphically. The transitive collapse $(M_\rho)^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]} = \{\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] : \alpha \in M_\rho\}$ is an initial segment in $OT(\mathbb{I})$ such that $(M_\rho)^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]} < \kappa$ if $\rho < \kappa \prec \mathbb{S}$. Note that both ρ and κ are uncountable cardinals, and the cardinality of the set M_ρ is equal to ρ.

Let us define simultaneously the followings: a set $OT(\mathbb{I})$ of terms over constants $0, \Omega, \mathbb{I}$ and constructors $+, \varphi, \psi$ and $\cdot^\dagger$, its subsets SSt, LS with $St = SSt \cup LS$, and sets $M_\rho\,(\rho \in \Psi)$, finite sets $K_X(\alpha)$ of ordinals for $\sigma \in St$ and $X \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$.

$\kappa \in St$ is intended to designate that κ is a shrewd cardinal, or κ is a stable ordinal. $\kappa \in SSt$ [$\kappa \in LS$] is intended to designate that κ is a successor stable ordinal [κ is a limit of stable ordinals], resp.

For $\alpha = \psi^f_\pi(a)$, let $m(\alpha) = f$. $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) = \bigcup\{\{c\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f(c)) : c \in \mathrm{supp}(f)\}$. Immediate subterms of terms are defined as follows. $k(\alpha_m + \cdots + \alpha_0) = \{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_m\}$, $k(\varphi\alpha\beta) = \{\alpha, \beta\}$, and $k(\psi^f_\sigma(\alpha)) = \{\sigma, \alpha\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)$.

$\alpha =_{NF} \alpha_m + \cdots + \alpha_0$ means that $\alpha = \alpha_m + \cdots + \alpha_0$ and $\alpha_m \geq \cdots \geq \alpha_0$ and each α_i is a non-zero additive principal number. $\alpha =_{NF} \varphi\beta\gamma$ means that $\alpha = \varphi\beta\gamma$ and $\beta, \gamma < \alpha$.

Note that in the following Definition 3.23, e.g., there is no clause for constructing $\kappa = \psi_{\mathbb{S}}(a)$ from a for $\mathbb{S} \in LS$.

Definition 3.22 $\alpha \in \Psi :\Leftrightarrow \exists \kappa, f, a(\alpha = \psi^f_\kappa(a))$.

1. Let $\alpha \prec \mathbb{S}$ for an $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$ and $b = \mathtt{p}_0(\alpha)$. Then let

$$M_\alpha := \mathcal{H}_b(\alpha) \tag{8}$$

2. For $\alpha \in \Psi$ an ordinal $\mathtt{p}_0(\alpha)$ is defined. $L(\mathbb{S})$ is defined in Definition 3.25.

   (a) Let $\alpha \preceq \psi^g_{\mathbb{S}}(b)$ for an $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$. Then $\mathtt{p}_0(\alpha) = b$.

   (b) There exists an $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$ and a $\tau \in L(\mathbb{S})$ such that $\alpha \prec \tau^{\dagger k}$ for a $k > 0$. Let $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$ be such that either $\rho = \tau$ or $\tau \prec^R \kappa \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho]\} \cup \{\rho^{\dagger m} : m > 0\}$. Then $\alpha = \beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ for a $\beta \in M_\rho$. Let $\mathtt{p}_0(\alpha) = \mathtt{p}_0(\beta)$.

   (c) $\mathtt{p}_0(\alpha) = 0$ otherwise.

Definition 3.23 (Definitions of $OT(\mathbb{I})$ and $K_X(\alpha)$)
Let $St = SSt \cup LSt \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$. For $\delta, \alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I})$, $K_\delta(\alpha) = K_X(\alpha)$, where $X = \{\beta \in OT(\mathbb{I}) : \beta < \delta\}$.

1. $\{0, \Omega, \mathbb{I}\} \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$ and $\{\Omega^{\dagger k} : 0 < k < \omega\} \subset SSt$. Let $\Omega^\dagger := \Omega^{\dagger 1}$, and $(\Omega^{\dagger k})^\dagger := \Omega^{\dagger(k+1)}$. $m(\alpha) = K_X(\alpha) = \emptyset$ for $\alpha \in \{0, \Omega, \mathbb{I}\} \cup \{\Omega^{\dagger k} : 0 < k < \omega\}$.

2. If $\alpha =_{NF} \alpha_m + \cdots + \alpha_0 \, (m > 0)$ with $\{\alpha_i : i \leq m\} \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$, then $\alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I})$, and $m(\alpha) = \emptyset$.

   Let $\alpha =_{NF} \varphi\beta\gamma$ with $\{\beta, \gamma\} \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$. Then $\alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ and $m(\alpha) = \emptyset$. $K_X(\alpha) = K_X(k(\alpha))$.

3. Let $\alpha = \psi_\Omega(a)$ with $a \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ and $K_\alpha(a) < a$. Then $\alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I})$.

   Let $m(\alpha) = \emptyset$. $K_X(\alpha) = \emptyset$ if $\alpha \in X$. $K_X(\alpha) = \{a\} \cup K_X(a)$ if $\alpha \notin X$.

4. Let $\alpha = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(a)$ with $a \in OT(\mathbb{I})$, and $K_\alpha(a) < a$. Then $\alpha \in LS$ and $\{\alpha^{\dagger n} : 0 < n < \omega\} \subset SSt$. Let $(\alpha^{\dagger n})^\dagger := \alpha^{\dagger(n+1)}$ for $n \geq 0$ with $\alpha^{\dagger 0} := \alpha$. For $n \geq 0$, $m(\alpha^{\dagger n}) = \emptyset$. Also for $n > 0$, $K_X(\alpha^{\dagger n}) = \emptyset$ if $\alpha^{\dagger n} \in X$. $K_X(\alpha^{\dagger n}) = K_X(\alpha)$ if $\alpha^{\dagger n} \notin X$. $K_X(\alpha) = \emptyset$ if $\alpha \in X$. $K_X(\alpha) = \{a\} \cup K_X(a)$ if $\alpha \notin X$.

5. Let $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$ and $\alpha = \psi^f_{\mathbb{S}}(a)$, where $\{a, \mathbb{S}\} \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$, and if $f \neq \emptyset$, then there are $\{d, \xi\} \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$ such that $\mathrm{supp}(f) = \{d\}$, $0 < f(d) = \xi < \mathbb{I}^2$, $d < \mathbb{I}$. If $K_\alpha(\{a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}_N}(f)) < a$ for $SC_{\mathbb{I}_N}(f) = \{d, \xi\}$,

$$K_\alpha(k(\mathbb{T})) \cup \{b\} < a \tag{9}$$

   if $\mathbb{T} = \psi^g_\sigma(b)$ with $k(\mathbb{T}) = \{\sigma, b\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}_N}(g)$, and

$$SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(SC_{\mathbb{I}}(a)) \tag{10}$$

   then $\alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I})$, where $a = \mathtt{p}_0(\alpha)$, and $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(a)$ denotes the set of strongly critical subterms$< \mathbb{I}$ of a. Namely $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathbb{I}) = \emptyset$, $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(a) = \{a\}$ when $a < \mathbb{I}$ is a strongly critical number, $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\varphi_\alpha(\beta)) = SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\alpha) \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\beta)$ and $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(a_0 + \cdots + a_{n-1}) = \bigcup_{i<n} SC_{\mathbb{I}}(a_i)$.

   Let $m(\alpha) = f$. $K_X(\alpha) = \emptyset$ if $\alpha \in X$. $K_X(\alpha) = \{a\} \cup K_X(\{a, \mathbb{S}\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f))$ if $\alpha \notin X$.

6. Let $\{\pi, a, d\} \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$ with $\pi \prec \mathbb{S} \in SSt$, $m(\pi) = f$, $d < c \in \mathrm{supp}(f)$, and $(d, c) \cap \mathrm{supp}(f) = \emptyset$.

   When $g \neq \emptyset$, let g be an irreducible finite function such that $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$, $g_d = f_d$, $(d, c) \cap \mathrm{supp}(g) = \emptyset$, $g(d) < f(d) + \tilde{\theta}_{c-d}(f(c); \mathbb{I}) \cdot \omega$, and $g <^c_{\mathbb{I}} f(c)$.

   Then $\alpha = \psi^g_\pi(a) \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ if $K_\alpha(k(\alpha)) < a$, and

$$SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \cup \{\mathfrak{p}_0(\alpha)\} \subset M_\alpha \tag{11}$$

   Let $m(\alpha) = g$. $K_X(\alpha) = \emptyset$ if $\alpha \in X$. $K_X(\alpha) = \{a\} \cup K_X(k(\alpha))$ if $\alpha \notin X$.

7. Let $\alpha = \beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ with $\beta \in M_\rho$, $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$, and $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$. Then $\alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I})$.

Sets $\mathcal{H}_\gamma(X)$ are defined for $\{\gamma\} \cup X \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$ in such a way that $OT(\mathbb{I}) = \mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon_{\mathbb{I}+1}}(0)$. In particular $\mathcal{H}_\gamma(X)$ is closed under Mostowski collapsing $\alpha \mapsto \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ if $\gamma \geq \mathbb{I}$, and differ from sets defined in Definition 3.7.

We define sets terms $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$, sets $K_X(\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}])$ and a relation $\beta < \gamma$ on $OT(\mathbb{I})$ recursively as follows.

Definition 3.24 (Definitions of $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ and $K_X(\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}])$)
Let $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$ and $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$. We define a term $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ for $\alpha \in M_\rho$.

Also $K_X(\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}])$ is defined recursively as follows. The map commutes with ψ, $\cdot^\dagger$, φ, $\mathbb{I}[\cdot]$, and $+$. $K_X(\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]) = \emptyset$ if $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] \in X$.

1. $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] := \alpha$ when $\alpha < \mathbb{S}$.

   In what follows assume $\alpha \geq \mathbb{S}$, $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] \geq \sigma$ and $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] \notin X$.

2. $(\mathbb{S})[\rho/\mathbb{S}] := \rho$, $(\mathbb{S}^\dagger)[\rho/\mathbb{S}] := \rho^\dagger$ and $(\mathbb{I})[\rho/\mathbb{S}] := \mathbb{I}[\rho]$.
   $K_X(\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]) = K_X(\rho)$ if $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho], \rho^\dagger\}$.

3. Let $\alpha = \psi^f_\kappa(a)$. Then $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = \psi^{f[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}_{\kappa[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}(a[\rho/\mathbb{S}])$, where $(f[\rho/\mathbb{S}]) : \Lambda[\rho/\mathbb{S}] \to \varphi_{\Lambda[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}(0)$, $\mathrm{supp}(f[\rho/\mathbb{S}]) = (\mathrm{supp}(f))[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = \{c[\rho/\mathbb{S}] : c \in \mathrm{supp}(f)\}$ and $(f[\rho/\mathbb{S}])(c[\rho/\mathbb{S}]) = (f(c))[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ for $f : \Lambda \to \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ and $c \in \mathrm{supp}(f)$.

4. Let $\alpha = \tau^\dagger$. Then $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = (\tau[\rho/\mathbb{S}])^\dagger$, where $\mathbb{S} < \tau^\dagger$, and $\tau^\dagger \in M_\rho$ iff $\tau \in M_\rho$. $K_X(\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]) = K_X(\tau[\rho/\mathbb{S}])$.

5. Let $\alpha = \mathbb{I}[\tau] \neq \mathbb{I}$. Then $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = \mathbb{I}[\tau[\rho/\mathbb{S}]]$, where $\mathbb{I}[\tau] \in M_\rho$ iff $\tau \in M_\rho$. $K_X(\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]) = K_X(\tau[\rho/\mathbb{S}])$.

6. Let $\alpha = \varphi\beta\gamma$. Then $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = \varphi(\beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}])(\gamma[\rho/\mathbb{S}])$.
   $K_X(\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]) = K_X(\beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}], \gamma[\rho/\mathbb{S}])$.

7. For $\alpha = \alpha_m + \cdots + \alpha_0$ $(m > 0)$, $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = (\alpha_m[\rho/\mathbb{S}]) + \cdots + (\alpha_0[\rho/\mathbb{S}])$. $K_X(\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]) = \bigcup\{K_X(\alpha_i[\rho/\mathbb{S}])) : i \leq m\}$.

A relation $\alpha < \beta$ for $\alpha, \beta \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ is defined according to Lemmas 3.9 and 3.12, Propositions 3.10, 3.13, and 3.20, and Corollary 3.15, provided that $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma(X)$ is replaced by $K_X(\alpha) < \gamma$. The relation enjoys $\psi^f_\kappa(a) < \kappa$ according to Lemma 3.12 and Corollary 3.15. Moreover we obtain $\mathbb{S} < \psi^{g_0}_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger}(b_0) < \mathbb{S}^\dagger$ and $LS \ni \tau_0 = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(c_0) < \psi^{h_0}_{\tau_0^\dagger}(d_0) < \tau_0^\dagger < \mathbb{I}$ by Proposition 3.13 and Lemma 3.9. Hence if $\mathbb{S} < \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(c_0)$, then $\mathbb{S} < \psi^{g_0}_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger}(b_0) < \mathbb{S}^\dagger < \tau_0 = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(c_0) < \psi^{h_0}_{\tau_0^\dagger}(d_0) < \tau_0^\dagger < \mathbb{I}$. The Mostowski collapsing $\cdot[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ maps this isomorphically to $\rho < \psi^g_{\rho^\dagger}(b) < \rho^\dagger < \tau = \psi_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]}(c) < \psi^h_{\tau^\dagger}(d) < \tau^\dagger < \mathbb{I}[\rho]$, where $b = b_0[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$, etc.

Definition 3.25 For terms $\pi, \kappa \in OT(\mathbb{I})$, a relation $\pi \prec^R \kappa$ is defined recursively as follows.

1. If $\pi \prec \kappa$, then each of $\pi \prec^R \kappa$, $\pi^{\dagger k} \prec^R \kappa$ and $\mathbb{I}[\pi] \prec^R \kappa$ holds when $\pi^{\dagger k}, \mathbb{I}[\pi] \in OT(\mathbb{I})$.
2. $\tau \prec^R \pi \prec^R \kappa \Rightarrow \tau \prec^R \kappa$.

Let $\pi \preceq^R \kappa :\Leftrightarrow \pi \prec^R \kappa \vee \pi = \kappa$.

For $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$, let $L(\mathbb{S}) := \{\alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I}) : \alpha \prec^R \mathbb{S}\}$.

For each strongly critical number $\Omega < \alpha \notin \{\mathbb{I}\} \cup LS \cup SSt$, there exists a unique $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$ such that $\alpha \prec^R \mathbb{S}$. If $\beta \prec^R \mathbb{T}$ and $\alpha \prec^R \mathbb{S}$ with $\mathbb{T} < \mathbb{S}$, then $\beta < \alpha$. In other words, $L(\mathbb{T}) < L(\mathbb{S})$ for layers $L(\mathbb{S})$.

Definition 3.26 Let $\beta, \alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I}) \cap \mathbb{I}$ be strongly critical numbers. $\beta < \alpha$ iff one of the following cases holds:

1. $\beta = \psi_\pi(b)$, $\alpha = \psi_\kappa(a)$, $\pi = \kappa \in \{\Omega, \mathbb{I}\} \cup \{\sigma \in OT(\mathbb{I}) : \exists \rho(\sigma = \mathbb{I}[\rho])\}$ and $b < a$.
2. $\beta = \Omega$ and $\Omega \neq \alpha \neq \psi_\Omega(a)$.
3. $\mathbb{S}^{\dagger n} < \mathbb{T}^{\dagger m}$ iff $(\mathbb{S}, n) <_{lx} (\mathbb{T}, m)$ for $\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T} \in \{\Omega\} \cup LS$ and $n, m < \omega$.
4. (a) There is a $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$ such that $\alpha \prec^R \mathbb{S} > \beta = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)$.
   (b) There is a $\mathbb{T} \in SSt$ such that $\beta \prec^R \mathbb{T} < \alpha$.
5. There are $\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{S} \in SSt$ such that $\beta \prec^R \mathbb{T}$ and $\alpha \prec^R \mathbb{S}$ with $\mathbb{T} < \mathbb{S}$.
6. There is a $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$ such that $\beta, \alpha \prec^R \mathbb{S}$ and one of the following holds:
   (a) $\beta = \psi^f_\pi(b)$, $\alpha = \psi^g_\kappa(a)$, and there is a $\rho^\dagger \preceq^R \mathbb{S}$ such that $\kappa, \pi \preceq \rho^\dagger$ and one of the following holds: let Λ be the base of finite functions f, g.
      i. $\pi \leq \alpha$.
      ii. $b < a$, $\beta < \kappa$, and $K_\alpha(SC_\Lambda(f) \cup \{\pi, b\}) < a$
      iii. $b > a$ and $b \leq K_\beta(SC_\Lambda(g) \cup \{\kappa, a\})$.

iv. $b = a$, $\kappa < \pi$, and $b \leq K_\beta(\kappa)$.

v. $b = a$, $\pi = \kappa$, $K_\alpha(SC_\Lambda(f)) < a$, and $f <^0_{lx} g$.

vi. $b = a$, $\pi = \kappa$, and $b \leq K_\beta(SC_\Lambda(g))$.

(b) There are $\mathbb{I}[\rho] \prec^R \mathbb{S}$ and c, d such that $\beta \preceq^R (\psi_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]}(d))^{\dagger n}$, $\alpha \preceq^R (\psi_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]}(c))^{\dagger m}$ with $n, m > 0$ and $\psi_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]}(d) < \psi_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]}(c)$.

(c) There are $\rho^{\dagger k}$, $\mathbb{I}[\rho]$ such that $\rho \prec^R \mathbb{S}$, $\beta \preceq^R \rho^{\dagger k}$ and $\alpha \preceq^R \mathbb{I}[\rho]$.

(d) There are $\rho^{\dagger k} \preceq^R \mathbb{S}$ and $\sigma, \tau \prec \rho^{\dagger k}$ such that $\tau < \sigma$, $(\tau, \sigma) \neq (\beta, \alpha)$, $\alpha = \sigma \vee \alpha \preceq^R \mathbb{I}[\sigma] \vee \alpha \preceq^R \sigma^{\dagger n}$, and $\beta = \tau \vee \beta \preceq^R \mathbb{I}[\tau] \vee \beta \preceq^R \tau^{\dagger m}$ for some $n, m > 0$.

Lemma 3.27 *$(OT(\mathbb{I}), <)$ is a computable linear order. Specifically each of $\alpha < \beta$ and $\alpha = \beta$ is decidable for $\alpha, \beta \in OT(\mathbb{I})$, and $\alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ is decidable for terms α over symbols $\{0, \Omega, \mathbb{I}, +, \varphi, \psi, \dagger\}$.*

In particular the order type of the initial segment $\{\alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I}) : \alpha < \Omega_1\}$ is less than ω_1^{CK} if it is well-founded.

In what follows by ordinals we mean ordinal terms in $OT(\mathbb{I})$. $\ell\alpha$ denotes the length of ordinal terms α, which means the number of occurrences of symbols in α.

Proposition 3.28 *$SC_\mathbb{I}(m(\rho)) \subset M_\rho$.*

Proof. If $\rho = \psi^f_\mathbb{S}(a)$ with an $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$, then we obtain $f = m(\rho)$, $a = \mathtt{p}_0(\rho)$, $SC_\mathbb{I}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha) = M_\rho$ by Definition 3.23.5. Otherwise $SC_\mathbb{I}(m(\rho)) \subset M_\rho$ follows from (11) in Definition 3.23.6. □

Proposition 3.29 *There is no $\psi^f_\sigma(a) \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ such that $\rho < \psi^f_\sigma(a) \leq \rho^\dagger < \sigma$ nor $\rho < \psi^f_\sigma(a) < \mathbb{I}[\rho] < \sigma$*

Proof. This is seen from Definition 3.26. □

Lemma 3.30 *For $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$, $\{\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] : \alpha \in M_\rho\}$ is a transitive collapse of M_ρ in the following sense. Let $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\} \subset M_\rho$.*

1. *$\beta < \alpha \Leftrightarrow \beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}] < \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$.*
2. *$\beta \prec^R \alpha \Leftrightarrow \beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}] \prec^R \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$.*
3. *$\mathbb{S} < \gamma \Rightarrow \big(K_\gamma(\beta) < \alpha \Leftrightarrow K_{\gamma[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}(\beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}]) < \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]\big)$.*
4. *$(M_\beta)[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = M_{\beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}$.*
5. *$OT(\mathbb{I}) \cap \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = \{\gamma[\rho/\mathbb{S}] : \gamma \in M_\rho \cap \alpha\}$.*

Proof. We show Lemmas 3.30.1- 3.30.4 simultaneously by induction on the sum $2^{\ell\alpha} + 2^{\ell\beta}$ of lengths for $\alpha, \beta \in M_\rho$.

We see easily that $\mathbb{S} > \Gamma(\mathbb{I}[\rho]) > \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] > \rho$ when $\alpha > \mathbb{S}$. Also $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] \leq \alpha$. 3.30.2 and 3.30.4 are seen by IH.

3.30.1. Let $k(\psi^g_\kappa(a)) = SC_\mathbb{I}(g) \cup \{\kappa, a\}$. Let $\mathbb{S} < \beta = \psi^f_\pi(b) < \psi^g_\kappa(a) = \alpha$ with $k(\beta, \alpha) \subset M_\rho$. From IH with Definition 3.26 we see that $\beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = \psi^{f[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}_{\pi[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}(b[\rho/\mathbb{S}]) < \psi^{g[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}_{\kappa[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}(a[\rho/\mathbb{S}]) = \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$. Other cases are seen by IH.

3.30.3. Suppose $K_\gamma(\beta) < \alpha$ for $\mathbb{S} < \gamma$. Then $K_{\gamma[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}(\beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}]) < \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ is seen from IH and Lemma 3.30.1 using the fact $\gamma[\rho/\mathbb{S}] > \rho$.

3.30.5. Let $\beta \in OT(\mathbb{I}) \cap \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ for $\alpha \in M_\rho$. We show by induction on $\ell\beta$ that there exists a $\gamma \in M_\rho$ such that $\beta = \gamma[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$. If $\beta < \rho$, then $\beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = \beta$ Also $\rho = \mathbb{S}[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ and $\mathbb{I}[\rho] = (\mathbb{I})[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$. Let $\Gamma_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]+1} > \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] > \beta > \rho$. We can assume $\mathbb{I}[\rho] > \beta > \rho$ by IH.

If $\beta = \mathbb{I}[\tau]$, then $\mathbb{I}[\tau] > \tau$. Pick a $\kappa \in M_\rho$ such that $\kappa[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = \tau$. Then $\beta = (\mathbb{I}[\kappa])[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$.

If $\beta = \tau^{\dagger k}$ for $k > 0$, then $\tau^{\dagger k} > \tau$. Pick a $\kappa \in M_\rho$ such that $\kappa[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = \tau$. Then $\beta = (\kappa^{\dagger k})[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$.

Finally let $\beta = \psi^f_\pi(b)$ with $k(\beta) \subset \mathcal{H}_b(\beta)$, $b < \Gamma_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]+1}$ and $f : \Lambda \to \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ for $\pi \preceq \sigma^\dagger$. We have $\beta \prec \sigma^\dagger$, $\rho < \beta < \mathbb{I}[\rho]$, and $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$. By Definition 3.26 we obtain $\sigma \neq \mathbb{S}$. Suppose $\beta < \mathbb{S} < \sigma^\dagger$. Then $\alpha < \rho$ by Definition 3.26. Hence we can assume $\sigma^\dagger < \mathbb{S}$. Then we obtain $\rho < \sigma^\dagger < \mathbb{I}[\rho]$. Hence $\sigma \prec^R \mathbb{I}[\rho]$ or $\sigma \prec^R \rho^{\dagger k}$. By IH with $\pi \leq \sigma^\dagger$ there are $\{c, \kappa, \lambda\} \subset M_\rho$ and $g : \lambda \to \varphi_\lambda(0)$ such that $c[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = b$, $\kappa[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = \pi$, $\lambda[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = \sigma$, $SC_\mathbb{I}(g) \subset M_\rho$, $g[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = f$ in the sense that $(\mathrm{supp}(g))[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = \mathrm{supp}(f)$ and $(g(d))[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = f(d[\rho/\mathbb{S}])$ for every $d \in \mathrm{supp}(g)$. Let $\gamma = \psi^g_\kappa(c) \in M_\rho$. Then $\gamma[\rho/\mathbb{S}] = \psi^f_\pi(b) = \beta$ and $k(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_c(\gamma)$.

Other cases are seen by IH. □

Lemma 3.31 *1. Let $\alpha = \psi_\Omega(a)$ with $a \in \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha)$. Then $\mathcal{H}_a(\alpha) \cap \Omega \subset \alpha$.*

2. Let $\alpha = \psi_\mathbb{I}(a)$ with $a \in \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha)$. Then $\mathcal{H}_a(\alpha) \cap \mathbb{I} \subset \alpha$.

3. Let $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$, and $\alpha = \psi^f_\kappa(a) < \kappa$ with $\kappa \preceq \mathbb{S}$ and $\{\kappa, a\} \cup SC_\mathbb{I}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha)$. Then $\mathcal{H}_a(\alpha) \cap \kappa \subset \alpha$.

Proof. We see $\beta \in \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha) \cap \Omega \Rightarrow \beta < \alpha = \psi_\Omega(a)$ by induction on the lengths $\ell\beta$ of β. Lemmas 3.31.2 and 3.31.3 are seen similarly using the fact $\rho < \alpha \Rightarrow \mathbb{I}[\rho] < \alpha$ for $\alpha \in \{\psi_\mathbb{I}(a), \psi^f_\kappa(a)\}$. □

Proposition 3.32 *Let $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$, and $\rho = \psi^f_\kappa(a) < \kappa$ with $\kappa \preceq \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathcal{H}_\gamma(\kappa) \cap \mathbb{S} \subset \kappa$ for $\gamma \leq a$. Then $\mathcal{H}_\gamma(\rho) \cap \mathbb{S} \subset \rho$.*

Proof. If $\kappa = \mathbb{S}$, then $\mathcal{H}_\gamma(\rho) \cap \mathbb{S} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\rho) \cap \mathbb{S} \subset \rho$ by $\gamma \leq a$ and Lemma 3.31.3. Let $\kappa = \psi^g_\pi(b) < \mathbb{S}$. We have $\kappa \in \mathcal{H}_a(\rho)$ by (5), and hence $b < a$ by $\mathbb{S} > \kappa > \rho$. We obtain $\mathcal{H}_\gamma(\rho) \cap \mathbb{S} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\kappa) \cap \mathbb{S} \subset \kappa$. $\gamma \leq a$ with Lemma 3.31.3 yields $\mathcal{H}_\gamma(\rho) \cap \mathbb{S} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\rho) \cap \kappa \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\rho) \cap \kappa \subset \rho$. □

Lemma 3.33 *Let $\rho \in \Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$ for an $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$.*

1. *$\mathcal{H}_\gamma(M_\rho) \subset M_\rho$ if $\gamma \leq \mathrm{p}_0(\rho)$.*
2. *$M_\rho \cap \mathbb{S} = \rho$ and $\rho \notin M_\rho$.*
3. *If $\sigma < \rho$ and $\mathrm{p}_0(\sigma) \leq \mathrm{p}_0(\rho)$, then $M_\sigma \subset M_\rho$.*

Proof. 3.33.1. Let $\gamma \leq b = \mathrm{p}_0(\rho)$. We show $\alpha \in M_\rho = \mathcal{H}_b(\rho)$ by induction on $\ell\alpha$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma(M_\rho)$. Let $k(\alpha) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(M_\rho) \cap \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha)$ be such that $a < \gamma \leq b$ and $\alpha = \psi^g_\kappa(a) \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma(M_\rho)$. IH yields $k(\alpha) \subset M_\rho$. We obtain $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_b(\rho)$.

Other cases are seen from IH as in [2]. □

Definition 3.34 (Mostowski uncollapsing)
Let α be an ordinal term and $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$ with $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$. If there exists a $\beta \in M_\rho$ such that $\alpha = \beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$, then $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]^{-1} := \beta$. Otherwise $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]^{-1} := 0$. Let $X[\rho/\mathbb{S}]^{-1} := \{\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]^{-1} : \alpha \in X\}$ for a set X of ordinal terms.

We see that ordinal terms ρ and $\beta \in M_\rho$ with $\rho \leq \alpha = \beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}] < \Gamma_{\mathbb{I}[\rho/\mathbb{S}]+1}$ are uniquely determined from α, when such β and ρ exist.

3.3 Stepping-down

The following Definitions 3.35 and 3.36 are needed in subsection 5.2.

Definition 3.35 Let $s(f) = \max(\{0\} \cup \mathrm{supp}(f))$ for finite function f, and $s(\rho) = s(m(\rho))$.

Let $\Lambda < \mathbb{I}$ be a strongly critical number, which is a base for $\tilde{\theta}$-function. Let $f : \Lambda \to \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ be a non-empty and irreducible finite function. Then f is said to be *special* if there exists an ordinal α such that $f(s(f)) = \alpha + \Lambda$. For a special finite function f, f' denotes a finite function such that $\mathrm{supp}(f') = \mathrm{supp}(f)$, $f'(c) = f(c)$ for $c \neq s(f)$, and $f'(s(f)) = \alpha$ with $f(s(f)) = \alpha + \Lambda$.

Definition 3.36 Let f, g be special finite functions with base Λ, and $\rho \in \Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$ for a $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$. $\tilde{\theta}$ denotes the function $\tilde{\theta}_b(\xi; \Lambda)$ in Definition 3.1 with base Λ.

1. For ordinals $a \leq \Lambda$, $b < s(g)$, let us define a special finite function $h = h^b(g; a)$ and an ordinal $\alpha^b(g)$ as follows. $s(h) = b$, and $h_b = g_b$. To define $h(b)$, let $\{b = b_0 < b_1 < \cdots < b_n = s(g)\} = \{b, s(g)\} \cup ((b, s(g)) \cap \mathrm{supp}(g))$. Define recursively ordinals α_i by $\alpha_n = \alpha + a$ with $g(s(g)) = \alpha + \Lambda$. $\alpha_i = g(b_i) + \tilde{\theta}_{c_i}(\alpha_{i+1})$ for $c_i = b_{i+1} - b_i$. Finally let $h(b) = \alpha_0 + \Lambda$, and $\alpha^b(g) = tl((h^b(g; \Lambda))'(b)) = \tilde{\theta}_{c_0}(\alpha_1)$, where α_1 is defined for $a = \Lambda$.
2. For $c \leq \min\{s(f), s(g)\}$, let $f \lhd_c g :\Leftrightarrow \forall b < c(\alpha^b(f) < \alpha^b(g))$.
3. $f_b * g^b$ denotes a special function h such that $\mathrm{supp}(h) = \mathrm{supp}(f_b) \cup \mathrm{supp}(g^b)$, $h'(c) = f'(c)$ for $c < b$, and $h'(c) = g'(c)$ for $c \geq b$.

   For a finite function k, $f + k$ denotes a special function h such that $\mathrm{supp}(h) = \mathrm{supp}(f) \cup \mathrm{supp}(k)$ and $h'(c) = f'(c) + k(c)$.

4. For $d \leq s(\rho)$, $\sigma \in H_\rho(d, f)$ iff there is a finite function k such that $s(k) < d$, $\forall x \in \mathrm{supp}(k)[0 < k(x) < \alpha^x(m(\rho))]$, and $m(\sigma) = f + k$.

The following Proposition 3.37 is seen as in [2].

Proposition 3.37 *Let k be a finite function, f, g special finite functions such that $f_d = g_d$ and $f <^d g'(d)$ for a $d \in \mathrm{supp}(g)$, and $\rho \in \Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$ with $g = m(\rho)$.*

1. *For $b < d$ and $a < \Lambda$, $f_b = (h^b(g; a))_b$ and $f <^b (h^b(g; a))'(b)$.*
2. *For $d \leq c < s(f)$ and $a \leq \Lambda$, $h^c(f; a) <^d g'(d)$.*
3. *Let $b \leq e < d$, $a_0 < a < \Lambda$, and $h = (h^e(g; a_0)) * f^{e+1}$. Then $h_b = (h^b(g; a))_b$ and $h <^b (h^b(g; a))'(b)$.*
4. *If $m(\kappa) \lhd_b g$ and $\sigma \in H_\kappa(\min\{b, d\}, f)$, then $\sigma \in H_\rho(d, f)$.*
5. *If $m(\kappa) \lhd_b g$, $\sigma \in H_\kappa(b, h)$, $b \leq e$, $h \lhd_e g$ and $h_e = g_e$, then $m(\sigma) \lhd_e g$.*
6. *For $a < \Lambda$, $h^c(f; a) \lhd_c f$.*

4 Operator controlled derivations

We prove Theorem 1.1 assuming $(OT(\mathbb{I}), <)$ is a well ordering. Operator controlled derivations are introduced by W. Buchholz [5], which we follow. In this section except otherwise stated, $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \ldots, a, b, c, d, \ldots$ and $\xi, \zeta, \nu, \mu, \ldots$ range over ordinals in $OT(\mathbb{I})$, $f, g, h, \ldots$ range over finite functions.

4.1 Classes of sentences

Following Buchholz [5] let us introduce a language for ramified set theory RS.

Definition 4.1 *RS-terms* and their *levels* are inductively defined.

1. For each $\alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I}) \cap \mathbb{I}$, L_α is an RS-term of level α.
2. Let $\phi(x, y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ is a set-theoretic formula in the language $\{\in\}$, and $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ are RS-terms of levels$< \alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I}) \cap \mathbb{I}$.

   Then $[x \in L_\alpha : \phi^{L_\alpha}(x, a_1, \ldots, a_n)]$ is an RS-term of level α.

Definition 4.2 1. $|u|$ denotes the level of RS-terms u, and $Tm(\alpha)$ the set of RS-terms of level$< \alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I}) \cap (\mathbb{I} + 1)$. $Tm = Tm(\mathbb{I})$ is then the set of RS-terms, which are denoted by $u, v, w, \ldots$

2. *RS-formulas* are constructed from *literals* $u \in v, u \notin v$ by propositional connectives $\vee, \wedge$, bounded quantifiers $\exists x \in u, \forall x \in u$ and unbounded quantifiers $\exists x, \forall x$. Unbounded quantifiers $\exists x, \forall x$ are denoted by $\exists x \in L_{\mathbb{I}}, \forall x \in L_{\mathbb{I}}$, resp.

3. For RS-terms and RS-formulas ι, $\mathsf{k}(\iota)$ denotes the set of ordinal terms α such that the constant L_α occurs in ι, and $|\iota| = \max(\mathsf{k}(\iota) \cup \{0\})$.

4. Δ_0-formulas, Σ_1-formulas and Σ-formulas are defined as in [3]. Specifically if ψ is a Σ-formula, then so is the formula $\forall y \in z\, \psi$. $\theta^{(a)}$ denotes a Δ_0-formula obtained from a Σ-formula θ by restricting each unbounded existential quantifier to a.

5. For a set-theoretic Σ_1-formula $\psi(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ and $u_1, \ldots, u_m \in Tm(\kappa)$ with $\kappa \leq \mathbb{I}$, $\psi^{(L_\kappa)}(u_1, \ldots, u_m)$ is a $\Sigma_1(\kappa)$-*formula*. $\Delta_0(\kappa)$-formulas and $\Sigma(\kappa)$-formulas are defined similarly

6. For $\theta \equiv \psi^{(L_\kappa)}(u_1, \ldots, u_m) \in \Sigma(\kappa)$ and $\lambda < \kappa$, $\theta^{(\lambda,\kappa)} :\equiv \psi^{(L_\lambda)}(u_1, \ldots, u_m)$.

In what follows we need to consider *sentences*. Sentences are denoted A, C possibly with indices.

For each sentence A, either a disjunction is assigned as $A \simeq \bigvee(A_\iota)_{\iota\in J}$, or a conjunction is assigned as $A \simeq \bigwedge(A_\iota)_{\iota\in J}$. In the former case A is said to be a $\bigvee$-*formula*, and in the latter A is a $\bigwedge$-*formula*. It is convenient for us, cf. Lemma 5.5, to modify the assignment of disjunctions and conjunctions to sentences from [5] such that if $A \simeq \bigvee(A_\iota)_{\iota\in J}$ is a $\bigvee$-formula, then each A_ι is a $\bigwedge$-formula, and similarly for $\bigwedge$-formula A.

Definition 4.3 If A is a $\bigvee$-formula, then let $A^\vee :\equiv A$. Otherwise let $A^\vee :\equiv \left(\bigvee_{i\leq 0} B_i\right)$ with $B_0 \equiv A$. If A is a $\bigwedge$-formula, then let $A^\wedge :\equiv A$. Otherwise let $A^\wedge :\equiv \left(\bigwedge_{i\leq 0} B_i\right)$ with $B_0 \equiv A$.

Definition 4.4 1. For $v, u \in Tm(\mathbb{I})$ with $|v| < |u|$, let

$$(v\varepsilon u) :\equiv \begin{cases} A(v) & \text{if } u \equiv [x \in L_\alpha : A(x)] \\ v \notin L_0 & \text{if } u \equiv L_\alpha \end{cases}$$

and $(u = v) :\equiv (\forall x \in u(x \in v) \wedge \forall x \in v(x \in u))$.

2. $(v \in u) :\simeq \bigvee(A_{w,0} \wedge A_{w,1} \wedge A_{w,2})_{w\in J}$, and $(v \notin u) :\simeq \bigwedge(\neg A_{w,0} \vee \neg A_{w,1} \vee \neg A_{w,2})_{w\in J}$, where $A_{w,0} \equiv (w\varepsilon u)^\vee$, $A_{w,1} \equiv (\forall x \in w(x \in v))^\vee$ and $A_{w,2} \equiv (\forall x \in v(x \in w))^\vee$.

3. Let $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. $(A_0 \vee \cdots \vee A_{n-1}) :\simeq \bigvee((A_\iota)^\wedge)_{\iota\in J}$ and $(A_0 \wedge \cdots \wedge A_{n-1}) :\simeq \bigwedge((A_\iota)^\vee)_{\iota\in J}$ for $J := n$.

4. For $u \in Tm(\mathbb{I}) \cup \{L_\mathbb{I}\}$, $\exists x \in u\, A(x) :\simeq \bigvee(A_v)_{v\in J}$ and $\forall x \in u\, \neg A(x) :\simeq \bigwedge(\neg A_v)_{v\in J}$ for $A_v :\equiv ((v\varepsilon u)^\vee \wedge (A(v))^\vee)$ and $J = Tm(|u|)$.

5. $St(a) :\simeq \bigvee((\forall x \in \iota(x \in a))^\vee \wedge (\forall x \in a(x \in \iota))^\vee)_{\iota\in J}$ with $J = St \cap (|a| + 1)$ for $St \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$.

Let

$$[\rho]J = \{\iota \in J : \mathsf{k}(\iota) \subset M_\rho\}.$$

The rank $\mathrm{rk}(\iota)$ of sentences or terms ι is defined as in [2] so that the following Proposition 4.5 holds.

Proposition 4.5 *Let A be a sentence with $A \simeq \bigvee(A_\iota)_{\iota\in J}$ or $A \simeq \bigwedge(A_\iota)_{\iota\in J}$.*

1. $\mathrm{rk}(A) < \mathbb{I} + \omega$.
2. $\mathrm{rk}(St(a)) = \max\{13, \mathrm{rk}(a) + 8\}$.
3. $\omega|u| \leq \mathrm{rk}(u) \in \{\omega|u| + i : i \in \omega\}$, *and* $|A| \leq \mathrm{rk}(A) \in \{\omega|A| + i : i \in \omega\}$.
4. *For* $v \in Tm(|u|)$, $\mathrm{rk}(v\varepsilon u) \leq \mathrm{rk}(u)$.
5. $\forall \iota \in J(\mathrm{rk}(A_\iota) < \mathrm{rk}(A))$.
6. $\mathrm{rk}(\exists x \in L_\alpha B) = \alpha + 3$ *for* $B \in \Delta_0(\alpha)$ *and an epsilon number* α.

Let $\rho \prec \mathbb{S} \in SSt$. $\iota^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}$ is defined for RS-terms and RS-formulas ι. $\iota^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}$ denotes the result of replacing each unbounded quantifier Qx by $Qx \in L_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]}$, and each ordinal term $\alpha \in \mathsf{k}(\iota)$ by $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ for the Mostowski collapse in Definition 3.24. The following Propositions 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8 are seen from Lemma 3.30.

Proposition 4.6 *Let $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$.*

1. *Let v be an RS-term with $\mathsf{k}(v) \subset M_\rho$, and $\alpha = |v|$. Then $v^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}$ is an RS-term of level $\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$, $\left|v^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}\right| = \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ and $\mathsf{k}(v^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}) = (\mathsf{k}(v))^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}$.*
2. *Let $\alpha \leq \mathbb{I}$ be such that $\alpha \in M_\rho$. Then $(Tm(\alpha))^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]} := \{v^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]} : v \in Tm(\alpha), \mathsf{k}(v) \subset M_\rho\} = Tm(\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}])$.*
3. *Let A be an RS-formula with $\mathsf{k}(A) \subset M_\rho$ and $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$. Then $A^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}$ is an RS-formula such that $\mathsf{k}(A^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}) \subset \{\alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}] : \alpha \in \mathsf{k}(A)\} \cup \{\mathbb{I}[\rho]\}$.*

Proposition 4.7 *For RS-formulas A, let $A \simeq \bigvee(A_\iota)_{\iota\in J}$ and assume $\mathsf{k}(A) \subset M_\rho$ with $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$. Then $A^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]} \simeq \bigvee\left((A_\iota)^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}\right)_{\iota\in[\rho]J}$ for $[\rho]J = \{\iota \in J : \mathsf{k}(\iota) \subset M_\rho\}$.*

Proposition 4.8 *Let $\mathsf{k}(\iota) \subset M_\rho$ with $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$. Then $\mathrm{rk}(\iota^{[\rho/\mathbb{S}]}) = (\mathrm{rk}(\iota))\,[\rho]$.*

4.2 Operator controlled $*$-derivations

Inference rules are formulated in one-sided sequent calculi. Let $\mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] = \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\Theta)$ and $\mathcal{H}_\gamma = \mathcal{H}_\gamma(0)$.

We define a derivability relation $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$, where c is a bound of ranks of the inference rules (stbl) and of ranks of cut formulas. The derivability relation is designed to do the following job. An infinitary derivation $\mathcal{D}_0$ in the relation $\vdash^*$ arises from a finitary proof, in which inference rules (stbl) occur to prove an axiom for stability, cf. Lemma 4.13. Inferences (Σ-rfl) for $\mathbb{I}$ are removed by collapsing. Thus ranks of formulas in the derivations are lowered to ordinals less than $\mathbb{I}$ in the relation $\vdash^*$. The inference rules (stbl) are replaced by inferences $(\mathrm{rfl}(\rho, d, f, s))$ by putting a cap ρ on formulas to get a derivation $\mathcal{D}_1$ in another derivability relation $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^a_{c,s,e,\gamma_0} \Gamma$, cf. Lemma 5.1 in section 5.

Definition 4.9 A *finite family* is a finite function $\mathtt{Q} \subset \coprod_{\mathbb{S}} \Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$ such that its domain $dom(\mathtt{Q})$ is a finite set of successor stable ordinals, and $\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})$ is a finite set of ordinals in $\Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$ for each $\mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathtt{Q})$. Let $\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T}) = \emptyset$ for $\mathbb{T} \notin dom(\mathtt{Q})$ and $\bigcup \mathtt{Q} = \bigcup_{\mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathtt{Q})} \mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})$. Define $M_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})} = \bigcap_{\sigma \in \mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})} M_\sigma$.

For $A \simeq \bigvee(A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$ and $\iota \in J$

$$\iota \in [\mathtt{Q}]_A J = [\mathtt{Q}]_{\neg A} J :\Leftrightarrow \forall \mathbb{U} \in dom(\mathtt{Q}) \left(\mathrm{rk}(A_\iota) \geq \mathbb{U} \Rightarrow \mathsf{k}(\iota) \subset M_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{U})} \right)$$

and

$$\mathsf{k}^{\mathbb{S}}(\Gamma) := \bigcup \{ \mathsf{k}(A) : A \in \Gamma, \mathrm{rk}(A) \geq \mathbb{S} \}.$$

Definition 4.10 By an *uncollapsed formula* we mean a pair $\{A, \rho\}$ of RS-sentence A and an ordinal $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$ for a successor stable ordinal $\mathbb{S}$ such that $\mathsf{k}(A) \subset M_\rho$. Such a pair is denoted by $A^{\{\rho\}}$. When we write $\Gamma^{\{\rho\}}$, we tacitly assume that $\mathsf{k}(\Gamma) \subset M_\rho$.

We define a derivability relation $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$. The relation depends on an ordinal γ_0, and should be written as $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_{c,\gamma_0}^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$. However the ordinal γ_0 will be fixed. So let us omit it.

Note that if $\gamma_0 \leq \mathtt{p}_0(\sigma)$ for $\sigma \prec \mathbb{S}$, then $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0}(\sigma) \cap \mathbb{S} \subset \sigma$ by Proposition 3.32.

Definition 4.11 Let Θ be a finite set of ordinals, a, c ordinals, and $\mathtt{Q}_\Pi$ a finite family such that $\gamma_0 \leq \mathtt{p}_0(\sigma)$ for each $(\mathbb{S}, \sigma) \in \mathtt{Q}_\Pi$. Let $\Pi = \bigcup_{(\mathbb{S},\sigma) \in \mathtt{Q}_\Pi} \Pi_\sigma$ be a set of formulas such that $\Pi \subset \Delta_0(\mathbb{I})$, $\mathsf{k}(\Pi_\sigma) \subset M_\sigma$ for each $(\mathbb{S}, \sigma) \in \mathtt{Q}_\Pi$ and $dom(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \subset c$. Let $\Pi^{\{\cdot\}} = \bigcup_{(\mathbb{S},\sigma) \in \mathtt{Q}_\Pi} \Pi_\sigma^{\{\sigma\}}$.

$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_{c,\gamma_0}^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ holds for a set Γ of formulas if $\gamma \leq \gamma_0$

$$\mathsf{k}(\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \,\&\, \forall \sigma \in \bigcup \mathtt{Q}_\Pi \left(\mathsf{k}(\Pi_\sigma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta^{(\sigma)}] \right) \tag{12}$$

$$\forall \mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \left(\{\gamma, a, c, \gamma_0\} \cup \mathsf{k}^{\mathbb{S}}(\Gamma, \Pi) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S})}] \right)^{3} \tag{13}$$

$$\forall \{\mathbb{U} \leq \mathbb{S}\} \subset dom(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \left(\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{U})}] \right) \tag{14}$$

and one of the following cases holds:

($\bigvee$) There exist $A \simeq \bigvee(A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$, an ordinal $a(\iota) < a$ and an $\iota \in J$ such that $A \in \Gamma$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma, A_\iota; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$.

($\bigvee$)$^{\{\cdot\}}$ There exist $A \equiv B^{\{\sigma\}} \in \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$, $B \simeq \bigvee(B_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$, an ordinal $a(\iota) < a$ and an $\iota \in [\sigma]J$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}, A_\iota$ with $A_\iota \equiv B_\iota^{\{\sigma\}}$.

($\bigwedge$) There exist $A \simeq \bigwedge(A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$, ordinals $a(\iota) < a$ such that $A \in \Gamma$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathsf{k}(\iota); \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma, A_\iota; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ holds for each $\iota \in [\mathtt{Q}_\Pi]_A J$.

[3] (13) means $\{\gamma, a, c, \gamma_0\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ when $dom(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi) = \emptyset$.

$(\bigwedge)^{\{\cdot\}}$ There exist $A \equiv B^{\{\sigma\}} \in \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$, $B \simeq \bigwedge(B_\iota)_{\iota\in J}$, ordinals $a(\iota) < a$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathsf{k}(\iota); \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma; B_\iota^{\{\sigma\}}, \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ for each $\iota \in [\mathtt{Q}_\Pi]_B J \cap [\sigma]J$.

(cut) There exist an ordinal $a_0 < a$ and a formula C such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma, \neg C; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} C, \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ with $\mathrm{rk}(C) < c$.

$(\Sigma(St)\text{-rfl})$ $c \geq \mathbb{I}$. There exist ordinals $a_\ell, a_r < a$ and a formula $C \in \Sigma(St)$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_\ell} \Gamma, C; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_r} \neg\exists x\, C^{(x,\mathbb{I})}, \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$.

$(\Sigma(\Omega)\text{-rfl})$ $c \geq \Omega$. There exist ordinals $a_\ell, a_r < a$ and a formula $C \in \Sigma(\Omega)$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_\ell} \Gamma, C; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_r} \neg\exists x < \Omega\, C^{(x,\Omega)}, \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$.

$(\mathrm{stbl}(\mathbb{S}))$ There exist an ordinal $a_0 < a$, a successor stable ordinal $\mathbb{S} < c$, a $\bigwedge$-formula $B(0) \in \Delta_0(\mathbb{S})$ and a $u \in Tm(\mathbb{I})$ for which the following hold:

$$\forall \mathbb{U} \in dom(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \cap (\mathbb{S}+1)\, \big(\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{U})}]\big) \tag{15}$$

$\mathbb{S} \leq \mathrm{rk}(B(u)) < c$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma, B(u); \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$, and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma; \neg B(u)^{\{\sigma\}}, \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ holds for every ordinal $\sigma \in \Psi_\mathbb{S}$ such that $\mathtt{p}_0(\sigma) \geq \gamma_0$ and

$$\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S})} \subset M_\sigma \tag{16}$$

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma, B(u); \Pi^{\{\cdot\}} \quad \{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma; \neg B(u)^{\{\sigma\}}, \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}\}_\sigma}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}}$$

From (12) we see $\mathsf{k}(\Pi_\sigma^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \{\sigma\}]$ for $(\mathbb{S}, \sigma) \in \mathtt{Q}_\Pi$ and $\gamma \geq \mathbb{S}$. Hence $\mathsf{k}(\Pi^{\{\cdot\}}) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta \cup \bigcup \mathtt{Q}_\Pi]$ for $\gamma \geq \mathbb{I}$. We obtain $\mathsf{k}(\Gamma, \Pi) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ by (12).

We will state some lemmas for the operator controlled derivations. These can be shown as in [5].

Lemma 4.12 (Tautology) *Let* $d = \mathrm{rk}(A)$.

1. $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \mathsf{k}(A); \emptyset) \vdash_0^{*2d} \neg A, A; \emptyset$ *if* $\{\gamma, \gamma_0\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\mathsf{k}(A)]$.
2. $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \mathsf{k}(A) \cup \{\mathbb{S}, \sigma\}; \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_0^{*2d} \neg A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}; A^{\{\sigma\}}$ *if* $\{\gamma, \gamma_0\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\mathsf{k}(A) \cup \{\mathbb{S}\}]$, $\mathsf{k}(A) \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \subset M_\sigma$, $A \in \Delta_0(\mathbb{I})$ *and* $\gamma \geq \mathbb{S}$.

Proof. Each is seen by induction on $d = \mathrm{rk}(A)$. For example consider the lemma 4.12.2. We have $(\mathsf{k}(A) \cup \{\mathbb{S}, \sigma\}) \cap M_\sigma = \mathsf{k}(A) \cup \{\mathbb{S}\}$ for (12), (13) and (14), and $\mathsf{k}(A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}) \subset \mathcal{H}_\mathbb{S}(\mathsf{k}(A) \cup \{\sigma\})$ for (12). Let $A \simeq \bigvee(A_\iota)_{\iota\in J}$. Then $A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} \simeq \bigvee(A_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]})_{\iota\in[\sigma]J}$ by Proposition 4.7 and $\mathsf{k}(\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}) \subset \mathcal{H}_\mathbb{S}[\mathsf{k}(\iota) \cup \{\sigma\}]$.

Let $I = \{\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} : \iota \in [\sigma]J\}$. Then $A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} \simeq \bigvee(B_\nu)_{\nu\in I}$ with $B_\nu \equiv A_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$ for $\nu = \iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$ and $[\{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}]_{A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}} I = I$ by $\mathrm{rk}(A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}) < \mathbb{S}$. For $d_\iota = \mathrm{rk}(A_\iota) \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\mathsf{k}(A, \iota)]$ with $\iota \in [\sigma]J = [\{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}]_A J \cap [\sigma]J$ we obtain by IH

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \mathsf{k}(A, \iota) \cup \{\mathbb{S}, \sigma\}; \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_0^{*2d_\iota} \neg A_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}; A_\iota^{\{\sigma\}}}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \mathsf{k}(A, \iota) \cup \{\mathbb{S}, \sigma\}; \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_0^{*2d_\iota+1} \neg A_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}; A^{\{\sigma\}}}\,(\bigvee)^{\{\cdot\}}}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \mathsf{k}(A) \cup \{\mathbb{S}, \sigma\}; \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_0^{*2d} \neg A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}; A^{\{\sigma\}}}\,(\bigwedge)$$

and

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \mathsf{k}(A,\iota) \cup \{\mathbb{S},\sigma\}; \{(\mathbb{S},\sigma)\}) \vdash_0^{*2d_\iota} A_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}; \neg A_\iota^{\{\sigma\}}}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \mathsf{k}(A,\iota) \cup \{\mathbb{S},\sigma\}; \{(\mathbb{S},\sigma)\}) \vdash_0^{*2d_\iota+1} A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}; \neg A_\iota^{\{\sigma\}}}\,(\bigvee)}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \mathsf{k}(A) \cup \{\mathbb{S},\sigma\}; \{(\mathbb{S},\sigma)\}) \vdash_0^{*2d} A^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}; \neg A^{\{\sigma\}}}\,(\bigwedge)^{\{\cdot\}}$$

□

Lemma 4.13 (Embedding of Axioms) *For each axiom A in $S_\mathbb{I}$ there is an $m < \omega$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\mathbb{I}, \emptyset; \emptyset) \vdash_{\mathbb{I}+m}^{*\mathbb{I}\cdot 2} A; \emptyset$ holds.*

Proof. Let us suppress the operator $\mathcal{H}_\mathbb{I}$. We show first the axiom (2), $SSt(\sigma) \wedge \varphi(u) \wedge u \in L_\sigma \to \varphi^{L_\sigma}(u)$ by an inference (stbl($\mathbb{S}$)) for successor stable ordinals $\mathbb{S} < \mathbb{I}$. Let $B(0) \in \Delta_0(\mathbb{S})$ be a $\bigwedge$-formula, and $u \in Tm(\mathbb{I})$.

We may assume that $\mathbb{I} > d = \mathrm{rk}(B(u)) \geq \mathbb{S}$. Let $\mathsf{k}_0 = \mathsf{k}(B(0))$ and $\mathsf{k}_u = \mathsf{k}(u)$. We obtain by Tautology 4.12.1 $\mathsf{k}_0 \cup \mathsf{k}_u; \emptyset \vdash_0^{*2d} \neg B(u), B(u); \emptyset$. Let $\sigma \in \Psi_\mathbb{S}$ be an ordinal such that $\mathsf{k}_0 \cup \mathsf{k}_u \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \subset M_\sigma$ and $\gamma_0 \leq \mathfrak{p}_0(\sigma)$. Tautology 4.12.2 yields $\mathsf{k}_0 \cup \mathsf{k}_u \cup \{\mathbb{S},\sigma\}; \{(\mathbb{S},\sigma)\} \vdash_0^{*2d} B(u^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}); \neg B(u)^{\{\sigma\}}$. Then for $\exists x \in L_\mathbb{S} B(x) \simeq \bigvee(B(v))_{v\in J}$ with $\mathrm{rk}(\exists x \in L_\mathbb{S} B(x)) = \mathbb{S}+3$, we obtain $u^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]} \in J = Tm(\mathbb{S})$. We have for $B(u^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}) \equiv B(u)^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}$

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\mathsf{k}_0 \cup \mathsf{k}_u; \vdash_0^{*2d} \neg B(u), B(u); \quad \dfrac{\mathsf{k}_0 \cup \mathsf{k}_u \cup \{\mathbb{S},\sigma\}; \{(\mathbb{S},\sigma)\} \vdash_0^{*2d} B(u^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}); \neg B(u)^{\{\sigma\}}}{\{\mathsf{k}_0 \cup \mathsf{k}_u \cup \{\mathbb{S},\sigma\}; \{(\mathbb{S},\sigma)\} \vdash_0^{*2d+1} \exists x \in L_\mathbb{S} B(x); \neg B(u)^{\{\sigma\}}\}_\sigma}\,(\bigvee)}{\mathsf{k}_0 \cup \mathsf{k}_u \cup \{\mathbb{S}\}; \vdash_\mathbb{I}^{*\mathbb{I}} \neg B(u), \exists x \in L_\mathbb{S} B(x);}\,(\mathrm{stbl}(\mathbb{S}))}{\mathsf{k}_0 \cup \{\mathbb{S}\}; \vdash_\mathbb{I}^{*\mathbb{I}+1} \neg \exists x\, B(x), \exists x \in L_\mathbb{S} B(x);}\,(\bigwedge)$$

Therefore $(\mathcal{H}_\mathbb{I}, \emptyset; \emptyset) \vdash_\mathbb{I}^{*\mathbb{I}+\omega} \forall \mathbb{S}, v \left[SSt(\mathbb{S}) \wedge A(v) \wedge v \in L_\mathbb{S} \to A^{(\mathbb{S},\mathbb{I})}(v)\right]; \emptyset$, where $SSt(\alpha) :\Leftrightarrow (St(\alpha) \wedge \exists \beta < \alpha \forall \gamma < \alpha (St(\gamma) \to \gamma \leq \beta))$.

Next we show the axiom (1). Let α be an ordinal such that $\alpha < \mathbb{I}$. We obtain for $\alpha < \alpha^\dagger < \mathbb{I}$ with $d_0 = \mathrm{rk}(\alpha < \alpha^\dagger)$ and $\alpha^\dagger \leq d_1 = \mathrm{rk}(St(\alpha^\dagger)) < d_2 = \omega(\alpha^\dagger + 1)$ with $\alpha^\dagger \in \mathcal{H}_0[\{\alpha\}]$

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\{\alpha\}; \emptyset \vdash_0^{*d_0} \alpha < \alpha^\dagger; \emptyset \quad \{\alpha\}; \emptyset \vdash_0^{*2d_1} St(\alpha^\dagger); \emptyset}{\{\alpha\}; \emptyset \vdash_0^{*d_2} \alpha < \alpha^\dagger \wedge St(\alpha^\dagger); \emptyset}\,(\bigwedge)}{\{\alpha\}; \emptyset \vdash_0^{*d_2+1} \exists \sigma\, (\alpha < \sigma \wedge St(\sigma)); \emptyset}\,(\bigvee)}{\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash_0^{*\mathbb{I}} \forall \alpha \in ON \exists \sigma\, (\alpha < \sigma \wedge St(\sigma)); \emptyset}\,(\bigwedge)$$

$\Delta_0(St)$-Collection follows from an inference ($\Sigma(St)-$rfl), and the Δ_0-collection for the recursively regularity of Ω follows from an inference ($\Sigma(\Omega)-$rfl). □

Lemma 4.14 (Embedding) *If $S_\mathbb{I} \vdash \Gamma$ for sets Γ of sentences, there are $m, k < \omega$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\mathbb{I}, \emptyset; \emptyset) \vdash_{\mathbb{I}+m}^{*\mathbb{I}\cdot 2+k} \Gamma; \emptyset$ holds.*

Lemma 4.15 (Inversion) *Let $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ with $A \simeq \bigwedge(A_\iota)_{\iota\in J}$, $A \in \Gamma$, and $\iota \in [\mathtt{Q}_\Pi]_A J$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathsf{k}(\iota); \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma, A_\iota; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$.*

Proof. By induction on a. For (16) in inferences (stbl($\mathbb{S}$)), we need to prune some branches such that $\mathsf{k}(\iota) \subset M_\sigma$. □

Lemma 4.16 *Let* $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$. *Assume* $\forall \mathbb{U} \in dom(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \cap (\mathbb{S} + 1)\,\big(\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{U})}]\big)$ *and* $\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S})} \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \subset M_\sigma$ *with* $\sigma \in \Psi_\mathbb{S}$. *Then* $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{\cdot}$.

Proof. By induction on a. $(\Theta \cup \{\sigma\})_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S}) \cup \{\sigma\}} = \Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi}$ by the assumption and (14). We need to prune some branches at $(\bigwedge)$ and $(\bigwedge)^{\{\cdot\}}$ by $[(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\})]_A J \subset [\mathtt{Q}_\Pi]_A J$. □

Lemma 4.17 (Reduction) *Let* $C \simeq \bigvee(C_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$ *and* $\mathrm{rk}(C) \leq c$.

Assume $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma, \neg C; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ *and* $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*b} C, \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$. *Then* $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a+b} \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$.

Proof. By induction on b using Inversion 4.15 and Lemma 4.16. Note that if $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*b(\iota)} C_\iota, \Delta; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ for an $\iota \in J$ such that $\mathrm{rk}(C_\iota) \geq \mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi)$, we obtain $\mathsf{k}(C_\iota) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S})}] \subset M_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S})}$ by (13) and Proposition 3.33 with $\gamma \leq \gamma_0$. Hence $\iota \in [\mathtt{Q}_\Pi]_C J$ provided that $\mathsf{k}(\iota) \subset \mathsf{k}(C_\iota)$. □

Lemma 4.18 (Cut-elimination) *Let* $c \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi}]$ *and* $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_{c+b}^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$, *where either* $c \geq \mathbb{I}$ *or* $\neg(c < \Omega < c + b)$. *Then* $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*\varphi_b(a)} \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$.

Proof. By main induction on b with subsidiary induction on a using Reduction 4.17. □

Lemma 4.19 (Σ-persistency) *Let* $A \in \Sigma(\mathbb{I})$, $dom(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi) < \alpha < \beta \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi}] \cap \mathbb{I}$ *and* $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma, A^{(\alpha,\mathbb{I})}; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$. *Then* $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma, A^{(\beta,\mathbb{I})}; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$.

Proof. This is seen by induction on a. (13) follows from $\beta \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi}]$. □

Lemma 4.20 (Collapsing) *Let* $\Gamma \subset \Sigma(St)$ *be a set of formulas. Suppose* $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\psi_\mathbb{I}(\gamma))$ *and* $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_\mathbb{I}^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$. *Let* $\beta = \psi_\mathbb{I}(\hat{a})$ *with* $\hat{a} = \gamma + \omega^a < \gamma_0$. *Then* $(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_\beta^{*\beta} \Gamma^{(\beta,\mathbb{I})}; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ *holds.*

Proof. By induction on a as in [5]. We have $\{\gamma, a\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi}]$ by (13), and $\beta \in \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi}]$.

When the last inference is a (stbl($\mathbb{S}$)), let $B(0) \in \Delta_0(\mathbb{S})$ be a $\bigwedge$-formula and a term $u \in Tm(\mathbb{I})$ such that $\mathbb{S} \leq \mathrm{rk}(B(u)) < \mathbb{I}$, $\mathsf{k}(B(u)) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$, and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_\mathbb{I}^{*a_0} \Gamma, B(u); \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ for an ordinal $a_0 < a$. Then we obtain $\mathbb{S} \leq \mathrm{rk}(B(u)) < \beta$.

Consider the case when the last inference is a ($\Sigma(St)$-rfl) on $\mathbb{I}$. We have ordinals $a_\ell, a_r < a$ and a formula $C \in \Sigma(St)$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_\mathbb{I}^{*a_\ell} \Gamma, C; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_\mathbb{I}^{*a_r} \neg\exists x\, C^{(x,\mathbb{I})}, \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$.

Let $\beta_\ell = \psi_\mathbb{I}(\widehat{a_\ell}) \in \mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a_\ell}+1}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi}] \cap \beta$ with $\widehat{a_\ell} = \gamma + \omega^{a_\ell}$. IH with Σ-persistency 4.19 yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_\beta^{*\beta_\ell} \Gamma^{(\beta,\mathbb{I})}, C^{(\beta_\ell,\mathbb{I})}; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$. On the other, Inversion 4.15 yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\widehat{a_\ell}+1}, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_\mathbb{I}^{*a_r} \neg C^{(\beta_\ell,\mathbb{I})}, \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$. For $\beta_r = \psi_\mathbb{I}(\widehat{a_r}) \in \mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi}] \cap \beta$ with $\widehat{a_r} = \widehat{a_\ell} + \omega^{a_r}$, IH yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_\beta^{*\beta_r} \neg C^{(\beta_\ell,\mathbb{I})}, \Gamma^{(\beta,\mathbb{I})}; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$. We obtain $(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_\beta^{*\beta} \Gamma^{(\beta,\mathbb{I})}; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ by a (*cut*).

Note that since $\Pi \subset \Delta_0(\mathbb{I})$, inferences $(\bigwedge)^{[\cdot]}$ are harmless for the condition $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\psi_\mathbb{I}(\gamma))$. □

Lemma 4.21 *Let $\Gamma \subset \Sigma(\Omega)$ be a set of formulas. Suppose $\Theta \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma(\psi_\Omega(\gamma))$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \emptyset) \vdash^{*a}_{\Omega,\gamma_1} \Gamma; \emptyset$. Let $\beta = \psi_\Omega(\hat{a})$ with $\hat{a} = \gamma + \omega^a < \gamma_1$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}, \Theta; \emptyset) \vdash^{*\beta}_{\beta,\gamma_1} \Gamma^{(\beta,\Omega)}; \emptyset$ holds.*

Proof. By induction on a as in [5]. □

4.3 Operator controlled derivations with caps

Let us fix an ordinal $\gamma_0 \in \mathcal{H}_0$ and a strongly critical number $\Lambda \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0} \cap \mathbb{I}$, which depend on a given finite proof figure, and will be specified in the end of the next section 5. Λ is the base of the $\tilde{\theta}$-function $\tilde{\theta}_b(\xi) = \tilde{\theta}_b(\xi; \Lambda)$ in Definition 3.1.

Definitions 4.22.2, 4.23 and 4.24 depend on the ordinals γ_0, Λ.

Definition 4.22 1. By a *capped formula* we mean a pair (A, ρ) of *RS*-sentence A and an ordinal $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$ with a successor stable ordinal $\mathbb{S}$ such that $\mathsf{k}(A) \subset M_\rho$. Such a pair is denoted by $A^{(\rho)}$. It is convenient for us to regard *uncapped formulas* A as capped formulas $A^{(\mathtt{u})}$ with its cap $\mathtt{u}$. A *sequent* is a finite set of capped or uncapped formulas, denoted by $\Gamma_0^{(\rho_0)}, \ldots, \Gamma_n^{(\rho_n)}, \Pi^{(\mathtt{u})}$, where each formula in the set $\Gamma_i^{(\rho_i)}$ puts on the cap $\rho_i \prec \mathbb{S}_i$. When we write $\Gamma^{(\rho)}$, we tacitly assume that $\mathsf{k}(\Gamma) \subset M_\rho$ with $M_\mathtt{u} = M_\emptyset = OT(\mathbb{I})$.

A capped formula $A^{(\rho)}$ is said to be a $\Sigma(\pi)$-formula if $A \in \Sigma(\pi)$. Let $\mathsf{k}(A^{(\rho)}) := \mathsf{k}(A)$.

2. A quadruple $\mathtt{Q} = ((\mathtt{Q})_0, \partial\mathtt{Q}, \gamma^\mathtt{Q}_\cdot, \mathtt{d}^\mathtt{Q}(\cdot))$ is said to be a *finite family for pairs* (e, γ_0) *of ordinals* if $(\mathtt{Q})_0$ is a finite family in the sense of Definition 4.9 and the following conditions are met.

Let $dom(\mathtt{Q}) = dom((\mathtt{Q})_0)$, $dom_e(\mathtt{Q}) = \{\mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathtt{Q}) : \mathbb{S} < e\}$, $\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) = (\mathtt{Q})_0(\mathbb{S})$ and $\bigcup_e \mathtt{Q} = \bigcup\{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) : \mathbb{S} < e\}$.

(a) For each $\rho \in \mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})$, $m(\rho) : \Lambda \to \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ is special, and $\gamma^\mathtt{Q}_\mathbb{S} \leq \mathtt{p}_0(\rho)$. Then $\mathcal{H}_{\gamma^\mathtt{Q}_\mathbb{S}}(\rho) \cap \mathbb{S} \subset \rho$ by Proposition 3.32.

(b) $\partial\mathtt{Q}$ assigns a subset $dom_e(\mathtt{Q}) \ni \mathbb{S} \mapsto (\partial\mathtt{Q})(\mathbb{S}) \subset \{\rho \in \mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) : s(\rho) \leq \mathbb{S}\}$.

(c) $\gamma^\mathtt{Q}_\cdot$ is a map $dom_e(\mathtt{Q}) \ni \mathbb{S} \mapsto \gamma^\mathtt{Q}_\mathbb{S}$ such that $\gamma_0 + \mathbb{I}^2 > \gamma^\mathtt{Q}_\mathbb{S} \geq \gamma_0 + \mathbb{I}$, $\gamma^\mathtt{Q}_\mathbb{S} \geq \gamma^\mathtt{Q}_\mathbb{T} + \mathbb{I}$ for $\{\mathbb{S} < \mathbb{T}\} \subset dom_e(\mathtt{Q})$, and the following (17) is met. $\mathtt{Q}$ is said to have *gaps* η if $\gamma^\mathtt{Q}_\mathbb{S} \geq \gamma^\mathtt{Q}_\mathbb{T} + \mathbb{I} \cdot \eta$ holds for $\{\mathbb{S} < \mathbb{T}\} \subset dom_e(\mathtt{Q})$, and $\gamma^\mathtt{Q}_\mathbb{S} \geq \gamma_0 + \mathbb{I} \cdot \eta$ for $\mathbb{S} \in dom_e(\mathtt{Q})$.

(d) $\mathtt{d}^\mathtt{Q}(\cdot)$ is a map $dom_e(\mathtt{Q}) \ni \mathbb{S} \mapsto \mathtt{d}^\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) < \mathbb{S}$ such that

$$\forall\{\mathbb{T} < \mathbb{S}\} \subset dom_e(\mathtt{Q}) \left(\{\mathtt{d}^\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})\} \cup \mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma^\mathtt{Q}_\mathbb{S} + \mathbb{I}}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]\right) \tag{17}$$

and

$$\forall\mathbb{S} \in dom_e(\mathtt{Q})[\partial\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) < \mathtt{d}^\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})] \tag{18}$$

which means that $\forall\rho \in \partial\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})[\rho < \mathtt{d}^\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})]$.

Let $SC_\Lambda(\mathtt{Q}) = \bigcup\{SC_\Lambda(m(\rho)) : \rho \in \bigcup \mathtt{Q}\}$.

A quadruple $\mathtt{Q} = ((\mathtt{Q})_0, \partial\mathtt{Q}, \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_\cdot, \mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{Q}}(\cdot))$ is simply denoted by $\mathtt{Q}$ when its boundary $\partial\mathtt{Q}$, $\gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_\cdot$ and $\mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{Q}}(\cdot)$ are irrelevant.

Definition 4.23 Let $\rho \in \Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$.

1. $\kappa \in L^{\mathtt{Q}}_\rho(s,\Theta)$ iff $\kappa \in \Psi_{\mathbb{S}} \cap \rho$, $\forall \mathbb{T} \in dom(\mathtt{Q}) \cap \mathbb{S}(\kappa \in M_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})})$, $\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})} \cup SC_\Lambda(m(\rho)) \cup \{\mathtt{p}_0(\rho)\} \cup (\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) \cap \rho) \subset M_\kappa$, $\gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}} \leq \mathtt{p}_0(\kappa) \leq \mathtt{p}_0(\rho)$ and $m(\kappa)$ is special such that $\forall\{\mathbb{T} \leq \mathbb{S}\} \subset dom(\mathtt{Q})(SC_\Lambda(m(\kappa)) \subset M_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})})$ and $s(\kappa) \leq s$.

2. $H^{\mathtt{Q}}_\rho(d,f,s,\Theta)$ denotes the *resolvent class* defined by $\kappa \in H^{\mathtt{Q}}_\rho(d,f,s,\Theta)$ iff $\kappa \in L^{\mathtt{Q}}_\rho(s,\Theta)$ and $m(\kappa) \in H_\rho(d,f)$, cf. Definition 3.36.4.

Let Γ be a sequent, Θ a finite set of ordinals$< \mathbb{I}$, $\{\gamma, a, c, s, e\} \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$, and $\mathtt{Q}$ a finite family for (e, γ_0).

We define another derivability relation $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^a_{c,s,e,\gamma_0} \Gamma$, where c is a bound of ranks of cut formulas, e a bound of ordinals $\mathbb{S}$, s a bound of ordinals in the support $\mathrm{supp}(m(\rho))$, and $\mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{Q}}(\mathbb{S})$ a bound of ordinals ρ in the inference rules $(\mathrm{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho,d,f))$. The relation depends on an ordinal γ_0, and should be written as $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^a_{c,s,e,\gamma_0} \Gamma$. However the ordinal γ_0 will be fixed. So let us omit it.

For $A \simeq \bigvee(A_\iota)_{\iota\in J}$ and $\iota \in J$, let $[\mathtt{Q}]_{A^{(\rho)}} J = [\mathtt{Q}]_A J \cap [\rho]J$ with $[\mathtt{u}]J = J$, cf. Definition 4.9.

Definition 4.24 Let $\mathtt{Q} = ((\mathtt{Q})_0, \partial\mathtt{Q}, \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_\cdot, \mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{Q}})$ be a finite family for (e, γ_0), and a, c, s, e ordinals with $s, e < \Lambda$. Let $\Gamma = \bigcup\{\Gamma^{(\sigma)}_\sigma : \sigma \in \{\mathtt{u}\} \cup \bigcup \mathtt{Q}\}$ be a set of formulas such that $\mathtt{k}(\Gamma_\sigma) \subset M_\sigma$ for each $\sigma \in \bigcup \mathtt{Q}$.

$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^a_{c,s,e} \Gamma$ holds if $\gamma \leq \gamma_0$,

$$\forall \rho \in \bigcup_e \mathtt{Q}\left(\mathtt{k}(\Gamma_\rho) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta^{(\rho)}]\right) \tag{19}$$

$$\forall \mathbb{S} \in dom_e(\mathtt{Q})\left(\{\gamma, a, c, s, e\} \cup \mathtt{k}^{\mathbb{S}}(\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})}]\right) \tag{20}$$

$$\forall\{\mathbb{T} \leq \mathbb{S}\} \subset dom_e(\mathtt{Q})\left(\{\mathbb{S}, \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}}\} \cup SC_\Lambda(\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]\right) \tag{21}$$

and one of the following cases holds:

(Taut) $\{\neg A^{(\rho)}, A^{(\rho)}\} \subset \Gamma$ for a $\rho \in \{\mathtt{u}\} \cup \bigcup_e \mathtt{Q}$ and a formula A such that $\mathrm{rk}(A) < \mathbb{S}$ for a successor stable ordinal $\mathbb{S} \in dom_e(\mathtt{Q})$.

($\bigvee$) There exist $A \simeq \bigvee(A_\iota)_{\iota\in J}$, a cap $\rho \in \{\mathtt{u}\} \cup \bigcup_e \mathtt{Q}$, an ordinal $a(\iota) < a$ and an $\iota \in [\rho]J$ such that $A^{(\rho)} \in \Gamma$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{a(\iota)}_{c,s,e} \Gamma, (A_\iota)^{(\rho)}$.

($\bigwedge$) There exist $A \simeq \bigwedge(A_\iota)_{\iota\in J}$, a cap $\rho \in \{\mathtt{u}\} \cup \bigcup_e \mathtt{Q}$, ordinals $a(\iota) < a$ such that $A^{(\rho)} \in \Gamma$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathtt{k}(\iota); \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{a(\iota)}_{c,s,e} \Gamma, (A_\iota)^{(\rho)}$ for each $\iota \in [\mathtt{Q}]_{A^{(\rho)}} J$.

(*cut*) There exist $\rho \in \{\mathtt{u}\} \cup \bigcup_e \mathtt{Q}$, an ordinal $a_0 < a$ and a formula C such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{a_0}_{c,s,e} \Gamma, \neg C^{(\rho)}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{a_0}_{c,s,e} C^{(\rho)}, \Gamma$ with $\mathrm{rk}(C) < c$.

($\Sigma(\Omega)$-rfl) There exist ordinals $a_\ell, a_r < a$ and an uncapped formula $C \in \Sigma(\Omega)$ such that $c \geq \Omega$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{a_\ell}_{c,s,e} \Gamma, C$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{a_r}_{c,s,e} \neg\exists x < \pi\, C^{(x,\Omega)}, \Gamma$.

($\mathrm{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho, d, f)$) There exist a successor stable ordinal $\mathbb{S} < e$ such that $\forall \mathbb{U} \in dom(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \cap (\mathbb{S}+1)\left(\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{U})}]\right)$, and an ordinal $\rho \in \Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$ for which the following holds: $(\mathbb{S}, \rho) \in (\mathtt{Q})_0$ if $\mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathtt{Q})$.

$$\Theta \subset M_\rho \tag{22}$$

Let $\mathtt{R} = ((\mathtt{R})_0, \partial\mathtt{R}, \gamma^{\mathtt{R}}_\cdot, \mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{R}})$ be a finite family for (e, γ_0) such that if $\mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathtt{Q})$, then let $\mathtt{R} = \mathtt{Q}$. If $\mathbb{S} \notin dom(\mathtt{Q})$, then let

1. $dom(\mathtt{R}) = dom(\mathtt{Q}) \cup \{\mathbb{S}\}$, $\mathtt{R}(\mathbb{T}) = \mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\mathbb{T} \neq \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathtt{R}(\mathbb{S}) = \{\rho\}$.
2. $\partial\mathtt{R}$ extends $\partial\mathtt{Q}$, and $\partial\mathtt{R}(\mathbb{S}) \subset \{\rho\}$.
3. $\mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{R}}(\cdot)$ extends $\mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{Q}}(\cdot)$ and $\mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{R}}(\mathbb{S}) < \mathbb{S}$.
4. $\gamma^{\mathtt{R}}_\cdot$ extends $\gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_\cdot$ in such a way that $\gamma^{\mathtt{R}}_{\mathbb{T}} = \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{T}}$ for $\mathbb{T} \in dom(\mathtt{Q})$, $\gamma^{\mathtt{R}}_{\mathbb{S}} \geq \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{T}} + \mathbb{I}$ for every $\mathbb{S} < \mathbb{T} \in dom(\mathtt{Q})$, $\gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{U}} \geq \gamma^{\mathtt{R}}_{\mathbb{S}} + \mathbb{I}$ for every $\mathbb{S} > \mathbb{U} \in dom(\mathtt{Q})$, and $\gamma^{\mathtt{R}}_{\mathbb{S}} \geq \gamma_0 + \mathbb{I}$.

Also there exist an ordinal $d \in \mathrm{supp}(m(\rho))$, a special function f with $s(\rho), s(f) \leq s < \Lambda$, an ordinal $a_0 < a$, and a finite set Δ of uncapped formulas enjoying the following conditions (r1), (r2), (r3) and (r4). Let $\mathrm{rk}(\Delta) = \max(\{0\} \cup \{\mathrm{rk}(\delta) : \delta \in \Delta\})$.

(r0) $\rho \in \partial\mathtt{R}(\mathbb{S})$ if $s(\rho) \leq \mathbb{S} < s(f)$.

(r1) $\Delta \subset \bigvee_{\mathbb{S}}(d) := \{\delta : \mathrm{rk}(\delta) < d,\ \delta \text{ is a } \bigvee\text{-formula}\} \cup \{\delta : \mathrm{rk}(\delta) < \mathbb{S}\}$, cf. $\mathrm{rk}(\delta) < \mathbb{S} \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{rk}(\delta) < \mathbb{S} + 3$ in Proposition 4.5.

(r2) For $g = m(\rho)$, $SC_\Lambda(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{R}(\mathbb{T})}]$ for every $\mathbb{T} \leq \mathbb{S}$, and $f_d = g_d \,\&\, f^d <^d_\Lambda g'(d)$, cf. Definition 3.23.6.

(r3) For each $\delta \in \Delta$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{R}) \vdash^{a_0}_{c,s,e} \Gamma, \neg\delta^{(\rho)}$.

(r4) Let $(\mathtt{R}^\sigma)_0 = (\mathtt{R})_0 \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}$, $(\partial\mathtt{R}^\sigma)(\mathbb{S}) \cup \{\sigma\} = (\partial\mathtt{R})(\mathbb{S}) \cup \{\sigma\}$, $\gamma^{\mathtt{R}^\sigma}_\cdot = \gamma^{\mathtt{R}}_\cdot$, and $\mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{R}^\sigma} = \mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{R}}$.

One of the followings holds for $\Theta(\sigma) = \Theta \cup SC_\Lambda(m(\sigma)) \cup \{\sigma\}$:

(a) $\max\{s(\rho), s(f)\} \leq \mathbb{S}$ and, there exists a $\sigma \in L^{\mathtt{Q}}_\rho(s, \Theta)$ such that $m(\sigma) = f$ and a $\sigma \leq \sigma' < \rho$ such that $\forall \mathbb{T} \leq \mathbb{S}(SC_\Lambda(m(\sigma')) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}])$

$$\forall \mathbb{T} < \mathbb{S}\left(\sigma' \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma^{\mathtt{R}}_{\mathbb{S}} + \mathbb{I}}[\Theta_{\mathtt{R}(\mathbb{T})}]\right) \tag{23}$$

and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma, \sigma'\}, \mathtt{R}^\sigma) \vdash^{a_0}_{c,s,e} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\sigma)}$ holds.
The case is said to be *degenerated*.

(b) $\max\{s(\rho), s(f)\} > \mathbb{S}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\sigma), \mathtt{R}^\sigma) \vdash^{a_0}_{c,s,e} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\sigma)}$ holds for every $\sigma \in H^{\mathtt{R}}_\rho(d, f, s, \Theta)$.

$$\frac{\{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{R}) \vdash^{a_0}_{c,s,e} \Gamma, \neg\delta^{(\rho)}s\}_\delta \quad \{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\sigma), \mathtt{R}^\sigma) \vdash^{a_0}_{c,s,e} \Gamma, \Delta^{(\sigma)}\}_\sigma}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{a}_{c,s,e} \Gamma} \ (\mathrm{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho, d, f))$$

In this subsection the ordinals s and γ_0 will be fixed, and we write $\vdash^a_{c,e}$ for $\vdash^a_{c,s,e,\gamma_0}$.

Lemma 4.25 (Inversion) *Let $A \simeq \bigwedge(A_\iota)_{\iota\in J}$, $\iota \in [\mathtt{Q}]_{A^{(\rho)}}J$ be such that and there is no $\mathbb{S} \in dom_e(\mathtt{Q})$ such that $\mathrm{rk}(A) < \mathbb{S}$. If $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^a_{c,e} \Gamma$ with $A^{(\rho)} \in \Gamma$, then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathsf{k}(\iota), \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^a_{c,e} \Gamma, (A_\iota)^{(\rho)}$ holds.*

Proof. By induction on a. We need to assume that there is no $\mathbb{S} \in dom_e(\mathtt{Q})$ such that $\mathrm{rk}(A) < \mathbb{S}$ due to (Taut). In a $(\mathrm{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho, d, f))$, $\sigma \in H^{\mathtt{R}}_\rho(f, s, \Theta)$ is restricted to $\sigma \in H^{\mathtt{R}}_\rho(f, s, \Theta \cup \mathsf{k}(\iota)) \subset H^{\mathtt{R}}_\rho(f, s, \Theta)$, i.e., to σ such that $\mathsf{k}(\iota) \subset M_\sigma$. □

Lemma 4.26 *Let $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^a_{c,e} \Gamma$. Let $\forall\mathbb{U} \in dom(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \cap (\mathbb{S}{+}1)\ \big(\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{U})}]\big)$ and $\rho \in \Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$ be an ordinal such that $\Theta \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \subset M_\rho$, cf. (22), and $\mathtt{R}$, $\mathtt{R}^\sigma$ finite families in the inference $(\mathrm{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho, d, f))$ determined from $\mathtt{Q}, \rho$ and $\sigma \in H^{\mathtt{R}}_\rho(d, f, s, \Theta)$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{R}) \vdash^a_{c,e} \Gamma$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{R}^\sigma) \vdash^a_{c,e} \Gamma$.*

Proof. By induction on a. We need to prune some branches for $\Theta \subset M_\sigma \subset M_\rho$. □

Lemma 4.27 (Reduction) *Let $C \simeq \bigvee(C_\iota)_{\iota\in J}$, $\Omega \le \mathrm{rk}(C) \le c < \mathbb{I}$ and $dom(\mathtt{Q}) \cap (c, e) = \emptyset$. Assume $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q} \vdash^a_{c,e} \Gamma, \neg C^{(\tau)}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^b_{c,e} C^{(\tau)}, \Gamma$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{a+b}_{c,e} \Gamma$.*

Proof. By induction on b using Inversion 4.25 and Lemma 4.26. We may assume that $\mathrm{rk}(C) = c$, and we see that $C^{(\tau)}$ is not introduced by any (Taut) from the assumption $dom(\mathtt{Q}) \cap (c, e) = \emptyset$.

Let $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{b(\iota)}_{c,e} (C_\iota)^{(\tau)}, \Gamma$ for an $\iota \in [\tau]J$ and $\mathrm{rk}(C_\iota) \ge \mathbb{S}$ with $\mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathtt{Q})$. We obtain $\mathsf{k}(C_\iota) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})}]$ by (20). Hence $\mathsf{k}(\iota) \subset M_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})}$ if $\mathsf{k}(\iota) \subset \mathsf{k}(C_\iota)$. Therefore $\iota \in [\mathtt{Q}]_{C^{(\tau)}}J$. □

Lemma 4.28 (Cut-elimination) *If $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^a_{c+c_1,e} \Gamma$ with $\Omega \le c < \mathbb{I}$, $c \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_e}]$ and $dom(\mathtt{Q}) \cap (c, e) = \emptyset$, then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{\varphi_{c_1}(a)}_{c,e} \Gamma$.*

Proof. By main induction on c_1 with subsidiary induction on a using Reduction 4.27. □

5 Elimination of stable ordinals

5.1 Capping and recapping

In this subsection the relation $\vdash^*$ is embedded in $\vdash$ by putting caps on formulas, and then caps are changed to smaller caps. Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi}] \Leftrightarrow \forall \mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi)(\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S})}])$.

Lemma 5.1 (Capping) *Let $\Gamma \cup \Pi \subset \Delta_0(\mathbb{I})$ be a set of uncapped formulas. Suppose $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash^{*a}_{c,\gamma_0} \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$, where $a, c < \mathbb{I}$, $dom(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \subset c$, $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\mathtt{u}} \cup \bigcup_{\mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi)} \Gamma_{\mathbb{S}}$, $\Pi^{\{\cdot\}} = \bigcup_{(\mathbb{S},\sigma)\in\mathtt{Q}_\Pi} \Pi^{\{\sigma\}}_\sigma$.*

For each $\mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi)$, let $\rho_{\mathbb{S}} = \psi^{g_{\mathbb{S}}}_{\mathbb{S}}(\delta_{\mathbb{S}})$ be an ordinal with a $\delta_{\mathbb{S}} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi}]$ and a special finite function $g_{\mathbb{S}} = m(\rho_{\mathbb{S}}) : \Lambda \to \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ such that $\mathrm{supp}(g_{\mathbb{S}}) = \{c\}$ with $g_{\mathbb{S}}(c) = \alpha_{\mathbb{S}} + \Lambda$, $\Lambda(2a+1) \le \alpha_{\mathbb{S}} + \Lambda$, $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g_{\mathbb{S}}) = SC_{\mathbb{I}}(c, \alpha_{\mathbb{S}}) \subset \mathcal{H}_0(SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\delta_{\mathbb{S}})) \cap \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi}]$, cf. (10) and (21). Also let $\Pi^{(\cdot)} = \bigcup_{(\mathbb{S},\sigma)\in\mathtt{Q}_\Pi} \Pi^{(\sigma)}_\sigma$, $\widehat{\Gamma} = \Gamma^{(\mathtt{u})}_{\mathtt{u}} \cup \bigcup_{\mathbb{S}\in dom(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi)} \Gamma^{(\rho_{\mathbb{S}})}_{\mathbb{S}}$.

Let $\mathtt{Q}$ be a finite family for (c, γ_0) with $\gamma_0 \ge \gamma$ such that $\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) = \mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S}) \cup \{\rho_{\mathbb{S}}\}$ for $\mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi) = dom(\mathtt{Q})$, and $\alpha_{\mathbb{S}} + \mathbb{I} \le \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}} \le \delta_{\mathbb{S}} < \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}} + \mathbb{I}$. Also let $\partial\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) = \emptyset$ and $\mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{Q}}(\mathbb{S}) = 0$ for every $\mathbb{S}$, and $\Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi) = \Theta \cup SC_\Lambda(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \cup \bigcup \mathtt{Q}_\Pi$.

Assume $\forall\{\mathbb{T} \le \mathbb{S}\} \subset dom(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi)(\gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{T})}])$, $\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S}) \subset \rho_{\mathbb{S}}$, $\forall\mathbb{T} < \mathbb{S}(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S}) \subset M_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})})$, $\Theta \subset M_{\rho_{\mathbb{S}}}$, $\forall\mathbb{T} \le \mathbb{S}(SC_\Lambda(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S})) \subset M_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})})$, $\mathtt{p}_0(\sigma) \le \mathtt{p}_0(\rho_{\mathbb{S}}) = \delta_{\mathbb{S}}$ for each $(\mathbb{S}, \sigma) \in \mathtt{Q}_\Pi$, and $\mathtt{Q}$ has gaps 2^a.

Then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi), \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^a_{c,c,c,\gamma_0} \widehat{\Gamma}, \Pi^{(\cdot)}$ holds.

Remark 5.2 When $\alpha_{\mathbb{S}} = \Lambda(2a)$ and $\Theta = \emptyset$, $\delta_{\mathbb{S}} < \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}} + \mathbb{I}$ denotes the natural sum $\gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}} \# a \# c$. Then $\{a, c\} \subset \mathcal{H}_0(SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\delta_{\mathbb{S}}))$. Hence (10) is enjoyed for $\rho_{\mathbb{S}}$, cf. Proposition 6.5.2.

We have $\{\gamma_0, a\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi}]$ by (13). We intend to be $\gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}} = \gamma_0 + \mathbb{I} \cdot 2^a \cdot n$ for $n = \#\{\mathbb{T} \in dom(\mathtt{Q}) : \mathbb{T} \ge \mathbb{S}\}$. Then $\forall\mathbb{T} \le \mathbb{S}(\gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}])$ for (14).

On the other hand we have $\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S}) \subset \rho_{\mathbb{S}}$, and $\rho_{\mathbb{S}} = \max(\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}))$. Also $\{\mathbb{S}, \delta_{\mathbb{S}}\} \cup SC_\Lambda(g_{\mathbb{S}}) \subset \mathcal{H}_0(\{\mathbb{S}, a, c, \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}}\} \cup \Theta) \subset M_{\rho_{\mathbb{U}}} = \mathcal{H}_{\delta_{\mathbb{U}}}(\rho_{\mathbb{U}})$ for $\mathbb{U} \le \mathbb{S}$. Therefore $\rho_{\mathbb{S}} \in M_{\rho_{\mathbb{U}}}$ for $\mathbb{U} < \mathbb{S}$ by $\delta_{\mathbb{S}}, \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}} + \mathbb{I} \le \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{U}}$.

Proof of Lemma 5.1. This is seen as in [2] by induction on a. Let us write $\vdash^a_c$ for $\vdash^a_{c,c,c,\gamma_0}$ in the proof.

We have $\mathsf{k}(\Pi_\sigma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta^{(\sigma)}]$ and $\mathsf{k}(\Gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$ by (12), and $\Theta \subset M_{\rho_{\mathbb{S}}}$ by the assumption. Hence (19) is enjoyed in $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_\Pi, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^a_{c,c,c,\gamma_0} \widehat{\Gamma}, \Pi^{(\cdot)}$.

Let $\{\mathbb{T} \le \mathbb{S}\} \subset dom(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi) = dom(\mathtt{Q})$. By the assumption $\Theta \subset M_{\rho_{\mathbb{S}}}$ we obtain $\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S})} \subset \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \cap M_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})} = (\Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi))_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})}$, and $SC_\Lambda(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S})) \subset \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \cap M_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})} = (\Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi))_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}$. On the other hand we have $\{\gamma, a, c\} \cup \mathsf{k}^{\mathbb{S}}(\Gamma \cup \Pi) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S})}]$ by (13), and $\{\mathbb{S}, \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}}\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{T})}]$ by (14) and one of the assumptions. Hence $\{\gamma, a, c\} \cup \mathsf{k}^{\mathbb{S}}(\Gamma \cup \Pi) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[(\Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi))_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})}]$, and $\{\mathbb{S}, \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}}\} \cup SC_\Lambda(\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[(\Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi))_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$, and (20) and (21) are enjoyed.

Let $\mathbb{T} < \mathbb{S}$. We have $\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S}) \subset \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \cap M_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}$, and $\rho_{\mathbb{S}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}}+\mathbb{I}}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}] \subset M_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}$ by $\{\delta_{\mathbb{S}}, c, \alpha_{\mathbb{S}}\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi}]$, $\gamma \le \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}} + \mathbb{I}$ and $\delta_{\mathbb{S}} < \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}} + \mathbb{I}$. Hence $\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) \subset$

$\mathcal{H}_{\gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}}+\mathbb{I}}[(\Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi))_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$, and (17) is enjoyed.

Case 1. First consider the case when the last inference is a (stbl($\mathbb{S}$)): We have a successor stable ordinal $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta]$, an ordinal $a_0 < a$, a $\bigwedge$-formula $B(0) \in \Delta_0(\mathbb{S})$, and a term $u \in Tm(\mathbb{I})$ with $\mathbb{S} \leq \mathrm{rk}(B(u)) < c$.

For every ordinal σ such that (16), i.e., $\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S})} \subset M_\sigma$ and $\mathtt{p}_0(\sigma) \geq \gamma_0$

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma, B(u); \Pi^{\{\cdot\}} \quad (\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \sigma)\}) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma; \neg B(u)^{\{\sigma\}}, \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a} \Gamma; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}}$$

Let h be a special finite function such that $\mathrm{supp}(h) = \{c\}$ and $h(c) = \Lambda(2a_0{+}1)$. Then $h_c = (g_\mathbb{S})_c = \emptyset$ and $h^c <^c_\Lambda (g_\mathbb{S})'(c)$ by $h(c) = \Lambda(2a_0 + 1) < \Lambda(2a) \leq \alpha_\mathbb{S} = (g_\mathbb{S})'(c)$. Let $\mathtt{R} = \mathtt{Q} \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \rho_\mathbb{S})\}$ and $\sigma \in H^{\mathtt{R}}_{\rho_\mathbb{S}}(c, h, c, \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi))$, where $(\Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi))_{\mathtt{R}(\mathbb{S})} \cup \mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S}) \cup SC_\Lambda(m(\rho_\mathbb{S})) \cup \{\mathtt{p}_0(\rho_\mathbb{S})\} \subset M_{\rho_\mathbb{S}}$ and $\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S}) = \mathtt{R}(\mathbb{S}) \cap \rho_\mathbb{S} \subset \rho_\mathbb{S}$

Then $\sigma < \rho_\mathbb{S}$, $\forall \mathbb{T} < \mathbb{S}(\sigma \in M_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})})$ and $SC_\Lambda(m(\sigma)) \subset M_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S})} \cap M_{\rho_\mathbb{S}} \cap M_\sigma = M_{\mathtt{R}^\sigma(\mathbb{S})}$. Also $SC_\Lambda(m(\sigma)) \subset M_{\mathtt{R}^\sigma(\mathbb{T})} = M_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{T})} \cap M_{\rho_\mathbb{T}}$ for $\mathbb{T} < \mathbb{S}$.

For example let $\sigma = \psi^h_{\rho_\mathbb{S}}(\delta_\mathbb{S}{+}\eta)$ with $\eta = \max(\{1\} \cup E_\mathbb{S}((\Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi))_{\mathtt{R}(\mathbb{S})}) \cup \mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S}))$, where $E_\mathbb{S}(\Theta) = \bigcup_{\alpha\in\Theta} E_\mathbb{S}(\alpha)$ with the set $E_\mathbb{S}(\alpha)$ of subterms$< \mathbb{S}$ of α, cf. [2]. We obtain, cf. (11), $(\Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi))_{\mathtt{R}(\mathbb{S})} \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \cup \mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S}) \cup SC_\Lambda(m(\rho_\mathbb{S})) \cup SC_\Lambda(h) \cup \{\mathtt{p}_0(\rho_\mathbb{S})\} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\delta_\mathbb{S}+\eta}(\sigma) = M_\sigma$ by $(\Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi))_{\mathtt{R}(\mathbb{S})} \cup \{\mathbb{S}\} \cup \mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S}) \subset M_{\rho_\mathbb{S}}$, $SC_\Lambda(m(\rho_\mathbb{S})) = SC_\Lambda(g_\mathbb{S}) = SC_\Lambda(c, \alpha_\mathbb{S}) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi}]$ and $\{\delta_\mathbb{S}, a_0, c\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}_\Pi}]$.

Let $\mathbb{S} > \mathbb{U} \in dom(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi)$. Then $\rho_\mathbb{S} \in M_{\rho_\mathbb{U}}$ and $\sigma \in M_{\rho_\mathbb{U}}$ follows from $\{c, a, a_0, \delta_\mathbb{S}\} \cup (\Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi))_{\mathtt{R}(\mathbb{S})} \cup \mathtt{Q}_\Pi(\mathbb{S}) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi)] \subset \mathcal{H}_{\delta_\mathbb{U}}(M_{\rho_\mathbb{U}})$ and $\delta_\mathbb{S} + \eta < \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_\mathbb{S} + \mathbb{I} \leq \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_\mathbb{U} \leq \delta_\mathbb{U}$. Therefore $\sigma \in H^{\mathtt{R}}_{\rho_\mathbb{S}}(c, h, c, \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi))$.

Since $\mathtt{Q}$ is assumed to have gaps 2^a, we may assume that $\mathtt{R}$ as well as $\mathtt{R}^\sigma$ has gaps 2^{a_0}.

IH yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi), \mathtt{R}) \vdash_c^{a_0} \widehat{\Gamma}, B(u)^{(\rho_\mathbb{S})}, \Pi^{(\cdot)}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi, \sigma), \mathtt{R}^\sigma) \vdash_c^{a_0} \widehat{\Gamma}, \Pi^{(\cdot)}, \neg B(u)^{(\sigma)}$, where $\rho_\mathbb{S} > \sigma \in M_{\rho_\mathbb{S}}$ and $SC_\Lambda(m(\sigma)) \subset \bigcap_{\mathbb{T}\leq\mathbb{S}} M_{\mathtt{R}^\sigma(\mathbb{T})}$ by $SC_\Lambda(m(\sigma)) \subset M_\sigma$. We have $\mathbb{S} < s(\rho_\mathbb{S}) = s(h) = c \in \mathrm{supp}(m(\rho_\mathbb{S}))$ for (r0) and $\mathrm{rk}(B(u)) < c$ for (r1).

An inference $(\mathrm{rfl}_\mathbb{S}(\rho_\mathbb{S}, c, h))$ yields the following.

$$\frac{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi), \mathtt{R}) \vdash_c^{a_0} \widehat{\Gamma}, B(u)^{(\rho_\mathbb{S})}, \Pi^{(\cdot)} \quad (\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi, \sigma), \mathtt{R}^\sigma) \vdash_c^{a_0} \widehat{\Gamma}, \Pi^{(\cdot)}, \neg B(u)^{(\sigma)}}{(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi), \mathtt{Q}) \vdash_c^{a} \widehat{\Gamma}, \Pi^{(\cdot)}}$$

in the right upper sequents σ ranges over the resolvent class $\sigma \in H^{\mathtt{R}}_{\rho_\mathbb{S}}(c, h, c, \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi))$.

Case 2. When the last inference is a (*cut*): There exist $a_0 < a$ and C such that $\mathrm{rk}(C) < c$, $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma, \neg C; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a_0} \Gamma, C; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$. IH followed by a (*cut*) with an uncapped cut formula $C^{(\mathfrak{u})}$ yields the lemma.

Case 3. Third the last inference introduces a $\bigvee$-formula A.

Case 3.1. First let $A \in \Gamma_\mathbb{S}$ be introduced by a $(\bigvee)$, and $A \simeq \bigvee (A_\iota)_{\iota\in J}$. Then $A^{(\rho_\mathbb{S})} \in \Gamma^{(\rho_\mathbb{S})}_\mathbb{S}$. There are an $\iota \in J$, an ordinal $a(\iota) < a$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma, A_\iota; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$. We obtain $\mathtt{k}(\iota) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta] \subset M_{\rho_\mathbb{S}}$ by (12), $\Theta \subset M_{\rho_\mathbb{S}}$ and Lemma 3.33 with $\gamma \leq \gamma_0 \leq \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_\mathbb{S} \leq \delta_\mathbb{S} \leq \mathtt{p}_0(\rho_\mathbb{S})$. Hence $\iota \in [\rho_\mathbb{S}]J$. IH yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi), \mathtt{Q}) \vdash_c^{a(\iota)} \widehat{\Gamma}, (A_\iota)^{(\rho_\mathbb{S})}, \Pi^{(\cdot)}$. $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi), \mathtt{Q}) \vdash_c^{a} \widehat{\Gamma}, \Pi^{(\cdot)}$ follows from a $(\bigvee)$.

Case 3.2. Second $A \equiv B^{\{\sigma\}} \in \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ is introduced by a $(\bigvee)^{\{\cdot\}}$ with $B \simeq \bigvee (B_\iota)_{\iota\in J}$. Then $A \simeq \bigvee \left(B_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}\right)_{\iota\in[\sigma]J}$ by Proposition 4.7. There are an $\iota \in [\sigma]J$ and an ordinal $a(\iota) < a$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta; \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma; A_\iota, \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ for $A_\iota \equiv B_\iota^{\{\sigma\}}$. IH yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi), \mathtt{Q}) \vdash_c^{a(\iota)} \widehat{\Gamma}, (B_\iota)^{(\sigma)}, \Pi^{(\cdot)}$. We obtain $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi), \mathtt{Q}) \vdash_c^a \widehat{\Gamma}, \Pi^{(\cdot)}$ with $B^{(\sigma)} \in \Pi^{(\cdot)}$ by a $(\bigvee)$.
Case 3.3. Fourth the case when $A \in \Gamma_{\mathtt{u}}$ is introduced by a $(\bigvee)$ is seen from IH.
Case 4. Fourth the last inference introduces a $\bigwedge$-formula A.
Case 4.1. First let $A \in \Gamma_{\mathbb{S}}$ be introduced by a $(\bigwedge)$, and $A \simeq \bigwedge (A_\iota)_{\iota\in J}$. For every $\iota \in [\mathtt{Q}_\Pi]_A J$ there exists an $a(\iota) < a$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathsf{k}(\iota); \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma, A_\iota; \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$. Let $\iota \in [\mathtt{Q}]_{A^{(\rho_{\mathbb{S}})}} J \subset [\mathtt{Q}_\Pi]_A J$. IH yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \cup \mathsf{k}(\iota), \mathtt{Q}) \vdash_c^{a(\iota)} \widehat{\Gamma}, (A_\iota)^{(\rho_{\mathbb{S}})}, \Pi^{(\cdot)}$. We obtain $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi), \mathtt{Q}) \vdash_c^a \widehat{\Gamma}, \Pi^{(\cdot)}$ by a $(\bigwedge)$.
Case 4.2. Second $A \equiv B^{\{\sigma\}} \in \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ is introduced by a $(\bigwedge)^{\{\cdot\}}$ with $(\mathbb{S}, \sigma) \in \mathtt{Q}_\Pi$. Let $B \simeq \bigwedge (B_\iota)_{\iota\in J}$ with $A \simeq \bigwedge \left(B_\iota^{[\sigma/\mathbb{S}]}\right)_{\iota\in[\sigma]J}$. For each $\iota \in [\mathtt{Q}_\Pi]_B J \cap [\sigma]J$ there is an ordinal $a(\iota) < a$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathsf{k}(\iota); \mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \vdash_c^{*a(\iota)} \Gamma; A_\iota, \Pi^{\{\cdot\}}$ for $A_\iota \equiv B_\iota^{\{\sigma\}}$. Let $\iota \in [\mathtt{Q}]_{B^{(\sigma)}} J \subset [\mathtt{Q}_\Pi]_B J \cap [\sigma]J$. IH yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi) \cup \mathsf{k}(\iota), \mathtt{Q}) \vdash_c^{a(\iota)} \widehat{\Gamma}, (B_\iota)^{(\sigma)}, \Pi^{(\cdot)}$. $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\mathtt{Q}_\Pi), \mathtt{Q}) \vdash_c^a \widehat{\Gamma}, \Pi^{(\cdot)}$ follows from a $(\bigwedge)$ with $B^{(\sigma)} \in \Pi^{(\cdot)}$.
Case 4.3. Fourth the case when $A \in \Gamma_{\mathtt{u}}$ is introduced by a $(\bigwedge)$ is seen from IH. The lemma follows from IH when the last inference is a $(\Sigma(\Omega)$-rfl). □

Lemma 5.3 (Tautology) *Let* $\mathtt{Q}$ *be a finite family for* (e, γ_0). *Assume that* $\{\gamma, e, \mathbb{S}, \gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathtt{Q}}, s, \mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{Q}}(\mathbb{S})\} \cup SC_\Lambda(\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})) \cup \mathsf{k}^{\mathbb{T}}(A) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$ *for every* $\{\mathbb{T} \le \mathbb{S}\} \subset dom_e(\mathtt{Q})$, *and* $\mathsf{k}(A) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta^{(\sigma)}]$ *with* $\sigma \in \{\mathtt{u}\} \cup \bigcup_e \mathtt{Q}$.

Then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash_{0,s,e,\gamma_0}^{2d} \neg A^{(\sigma)}, A^{(\sigma)}$ *holds for* $d = \max\{\mathbb{S}, \mathrm{rk}(A)\}$ *with* $\mathbb{S} = \max(\{0\} \cap dom_e(\mathtt{Q}))$.

Proof. We obtain $\{\mathbb{S}, \mathsf{k}^{\mathbb{T}}(A)\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$ by the assumptions, and (20) is enjoyed in $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash_{0,s,e,\gamma_0}^{2d} \neg A^{(\sigma)}, A^{(\sigma)}$. When $\mathrm{rk}(A) < \mathbb{S} \in dom_e(\mathtt{Q})$, $\{\neg A^{(\sigma)}, A^{(\sigma)}\}$ follows from (Taut). If $\mathrm{rk}(A) \ge \mathbb{S}$, the lemma is seen by induction on d. Note that it might be $\mathrm{rk}(A) \notin \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})}]$ when $\mathrm{rk}(A) < \mathbb{S} \in dom_e(\mathtt{Q})$ even if $\mathsf{k}(A) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta^{(\sigma)}]$. □

Definition 5.4 Let $\mathtt{Q} = ((\mathtt{Q})_0, \partial\mathtt{Q}, \gamma_\cdot^{\mathtt{Q}}, \mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{Q}})$ be a finite family for (e, γ_0), b an ordinal, and $\kappa \in L_\rho^{\mathtt{Q}}(s, \Theta)$ with a $\rho \in \mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})$.

$\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]} = ((\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]})_0, \partial\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}, \gamma_\cdot^{\mathtt{Q}}, \mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}})$ denotes a finite family for (e, γ_0) defined as follows. $dom(\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}) = dom(\mathtt{Q})$, $\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}(\mathbb{T}) = \mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})$, $\partial\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}(\mathbb{T}) = \partial\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})$ and $\mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}}(\mathbb{T}) = \mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{Q}}(\mathbb{T})$ for $\mathbb{S} \neq \mathbb{T}$. For $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{S}$, let $\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}(\mathbb{S}) = \{\kappa\} \cup \{\mu \in \mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) : \mu \neq \rho\}$ and $\partial\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}(\mathbb{S}) = \{\mu \in \partial\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) : \mu \neq \rho\} \cup \{\kappa : b \le \mathbb{S}\}$. $\mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}}(\mathbb{S}) = \max(\{\mu : \rho \neq \mu \in \mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})\} \cup \{\kappa\} \cup \{\mu + 1 : \rho \neq \mu \in \partial\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})\} \cup \{\kappa + 1 : b \le \mathbb{S}\})$.

Let $f \le g :\Leftrightarrow \forall i(f'(i) \le g'(i))$ for special finite functions f, g.

Lemma 5.5 (Recapping) *Let* $(\mathbb{S}, \rho) \in \mathtt{Q}$ *and* $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_0}^a \Xi, \Gamma^{(\rho)}$ *with a finite family* $\mathtt{Q}$ *for* $(\mathbb{S}^\dagger, \gamma_0)$, *where* $a < \Lambda$, $\Xi = \bigcup\{\Xi_\sigma^{(\sigma)} : \rho \neq \sigma \in \bigcup \mathtt{Q} \cup \{\mathtt{u}\}\}$.

Let $b \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}}]$ *be such that* $\Gamma \subset \bigvee_{\mathbb{S}}(b)$ *and* $\mathbb{S} \leq b < s(\rho) \leq s < \Lambda$. *Let* $\kappa \in L^{\mathtt{Q}}_\rho(s,\Theta)$ *be such that* $m(\kappa) \lhd_b g$ *and* $h^b(g;\varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a)) \leq m(\kappa)$ *for* $g = m(\rho)$. *Then* $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\kappa), \mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}) \vdash^{\varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a)}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_0} \Xi, \Gamma^{(\kappa)}$ *holds for* $\Theta(\kappa) = \Theta \cup SC_\Lambda(m(\kappa)) \cup \{\kappa\}$.

Proof. By induction on a. The subscripts s, $\mathbb{S}^\dagger$ and γ_0 are fixed, and omitted in the proof. We write $\vdash^a_c$ for $\vdash^a_{c,s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_0}$.

Let $\kappa \in L^{\mathtt{Q}}_\rho(s,\Theta)$ with $g = m(\rho)$. By Definition 4.23 we obtain $\forall \mathbb{T} \in dom(\mathtt{Q}) \cap \mathbb{S}(\kappa \in M_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})})$, $s(\kappa) \leq s$, $\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})} \cup SC_\Lambda(g) \cup (\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) \cap \rho) \subset M_\kappa$ and $SC_\Lambda(m(\kappa)) \subset M_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}$ for $\mathbb{T} \leq \mathbb{S}$. Hence $\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})} \subset M_{\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}(\mathbb{S})}$ and $\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})} \subset (\Theta(\kappa))_{\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}(\mathbb{T})}$ for $\mathbb{T} \leq \mathbb{S}$. On the other hand we have $\{a, b, s(\rho)\} \cup SC_\Lambda(\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$ for $\mathbb{T} \leq \mathbb{S}$ by the assumption and (21). Hence $SC_\Lambda(m(\kappa)) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[(\Theta(\kappa))_{\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}(\mathbb{T})}]$, and (20) and (21) are enjoyed in $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\kappa), \mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}) \vdash^{\varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a)}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_0} \Xi, \Gamma^{(\kappa)}$.

Let $\mathtt{e} = \mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}}$ and $\mu \in \partial\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})$ with $\mu \neq \rho$. Then $\mu < \mathtt{e}(\mathbb{S})$. If $b \leq \mathbb{S}$, then $\kappa < \mathtt{e}(\mathbb{S})$. Hence $\partial\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}(\mathbb{S}) < \mathtt{e}(\mathbb{S})$, and (18) is enjoyed.

Let $\mathbb{S} > \mathbb{T} \in dom(\mathtt{Q})$. We have $\kappa \in M_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}$, and $\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}}+\mathbb{I}}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$ by (17). We obtain $\kappa \in \Theta(\kappa)_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}$ with $\kappa \in \Theta(\kappa)$, and $\kappa \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}}+\mathbb{I}}[\Theta(\kappa)_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$. This yields $\{\mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}}(\mathbb{S})\} \cup \mathtt{Q}^{\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}}(\mathbb{S}) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}}+\mathbb{I}}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$. Hence (17) is enjoyed for $\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}$.

Moreover $SC_\Lambda(h^b(g;\varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a))) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})}]$ and $\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})} \subset M_\kappa$. Proposition 3.33 with $\gamma \leq \gamma_0$ yields $SC_\Lambda(h^b(g;\varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a))) \subset M_\kappa$. Also $\mathtt{p}_0(\rho) \in M_\kappa$ by $\kappa \in L^{\mathtt{Q}}_\rho(s,\Theta)$, cf. (11).

Case 1. First consider the case when the last inference is a $(\mathrm{rfl}_{\mathbb{U}}(\lambda,d,f))$ for a $\mathbb{U} < \mathbb{S}^\dagger$ and $\lambda \in \Psi_{\mathbb{U}}$: First let $\lambda \neq \rho$. We may assume $\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{S}$. We obtain $\lambda \leq \mathtt{e}(\mathbb{S})$. Let $\sigma \in H_\lambda(d,f)$. Then $\sigma + 1 < \lambda$, and $\mathtt{d}^{(\mathtt{Q}^\sigma)_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}}(\mathbb{S}) = \mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}}(\mathbb{S}) = \mathtt{e}(\mathbb{S})$. When $s(\lambda) \leq \mathbb{S} < s(f)$, we have $\lambda \in \partial\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})$ by (r0), and $\lambda < \mathtt{e}(\mathbb{S})$.

IH followed by a $(\mathrm{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\lambda,d,f))$ yields

$$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\kappa), \mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}) \vdash^{\varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a)}_{\mathbb{S}} \widehat{\Pi}, \Gamma^{(\kappa)} \tag{24}$$

In what follows assume $\lambda = \rho$. We have $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$ for $\mathbb{T} \leq \mathbb{S}$ by (21), and $\Theta \subset M_\rho$ by (22). Since $\mathbb{S} < s(\rho)$, the inference is non-degenerated.

Let $g = m(\rho)$ and $d \in \mathrm{supp}(g)$. We have $\mathbb{S} < s(\rho)$, a sequent $\Delta \subset \bigvee_{\mathbb{S}}(d)$ and ordinals $a_0 < a$ such that $\mathrm{rk}(\Delta) < d \leq s(\rho)$ and

$$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{a_0}_{\mathbb{S}} \Xi, \Gamma^{(\rho)}, \neg\delta^{(\rho)} \tag{25}$$

for each $\delta \in \Delta$. Let $b_0 = \max(\{\mathbb{S}\} \cup \{\mathrm{rk}(\delta) : \delta \in \Delta\})$. Then $b_0 \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$ for every $\mathbb{T} \leq \mathbb{S}$ by (20) and (21), $b_0 < s(\rho) \leq s$. On the other side for each $\sigma \in H^{\mathtt{Q}}_\rho(d,f,s,\Theta)$

$$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\sigma), \mathtt{Q}^\sigma) \vdash^{a_0}_{\mathbb{S}} \Xi, \Gamma^{(\rho)}, \Delta^{(\sigma)} \tag{26}$$

f is a special finite function such that $f_d = g_d$, $f^d <^d g'(d)$ and $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$ for every $\mathbb{T} \leq \mathbb{S}$. We obtain $\sigma \notin \mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})$ by $\sigma < \rho$ and $\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) \cap \rho \subset M_\sigma$.

Case 1.1. $b_0 < b$: Then $\mathrm{rk}(\Delta) < b < s(\rho)$. By IH with (25) we obtain for each $\delta \in \Delta$

$$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\kappa), \mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}) \vdash^{\varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a_0)}_{\mathbb{S}} \Xi, \Gamma^{(\kappa)}, \neg\delta^{(\kappa)} \tag{27}$$

We claim for the special finite function $h = h^b(g; \varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a))$ and $d_1 = \min\{b, d\}$ that

$$f_{d_1} = h_{d_1} \,\&\, f^{d_1} <^{d_1} h'(d_1) \tag{28}$$

If $d_1 = d \leq b$, then $h_d = g_d = f_d$ and $g'(d) = g(d) \leq h'(d)$. Proposition 3.5 yields the claim. If $d_1 = b < d$, then Proposition 3.37.1 yields the claim.

Let $\sigma \in H_\kappa^{\mathfrak{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}}(d_1, f, s, \Theta(\kappa))$. We have $SC_\Lambda(m(\rho)) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathfrak{Q}(\mathbb{S})}]$ by (21) and $\Theta_{\mathfrak{Q}(\mathbb{S})} \subset M_\kappa$ by Definition 4.23. Hence $\Theta_{\mathfrak{Q}(\mathbb{S})} = \Theta_{\mathfrak{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}(\mathbb{S})} \subset M_\sigma$ and $SC_\Lambda(m(\rho)) \subset M_\sigma$. Therefore $\sigma \in H_\rho^{\mathfrak{Q}}(d, f, s, \Theta)$. By IH we obtain

$$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\kappa, \sigma), (\mathfrak{Q}^{[\kappa/\rho]})^\sigma) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{\varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a_0)} \Xi, \Gamma^{(\kappa)}, \Delta^{(\sigma)} \tag{29}$$

We obtain (24) by an inference $(\mathrm{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\kappa, d_1, f))$ from $\mathrm{rk}(\Delta) \leq b_0 < d_1$, (28), (27) and (29), where $d_1 \in \mathrm{supp}(m(\kappa))$, and $\kappa < \mathsf{e}(\mathbb{S})$ when $\kappa \in \partial\mathfrak{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}(\mathbb{S})$, i.e., when $b_0 < b \leq \mathbb{S}$ for (r0) and (18). Also if $\max\{s(\kappa), s(f)\} \leq \mathbb{S}$, it suffices to have a single $\sigma = \sigma' < \kappa$ such that $m(\sigma) = f$ with $\forall \mathbb{T} \leq \mathbb{S}(SC_\Lambda(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathfrak{Q}(\mathbb{T})}])$ and $\sigma' \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathfrak{Q}}+\mathbb{I}}[(\Theta(\kappa))_{\mathfrak{Q}_{\mathbb{S}}}]$ for (23).

Case 1.2. $b \leq b_0$: Let $\sigma \in L := H_\kappa^{\mathfrak{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}}(b, h, s, \Theta(\kappa))$ for $h = (h^{b_0}(g; \varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a_0)))* f^{b_0+1}$. We have $\sigma \in H_\kappa(b, h)$. Then $h^{b_0}(g; \varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a_0)) \leq h \leq m(\sigma)$ by Definition 3.36.4.

Let $\mathrm{rk}(\delta) = b_0 > \mathbb{S}$ for $\delta \in \Delta$. We have $\delta \simeq \bigvee(\delta_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$ and Inversion 4.25 with (25) yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \mathsf{k}(\iota), \mathfrak{Q}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{a_0} \Xi, \Gamma^{(\rho)}, \neg(\delta_\iota)^{(\rho)}$ for each $\iota \in \left[\mathfrak{Q}_{b_0}^{[\sigma/\rho]}\right]_{\delta^{(\sigma)}} J \subset [\mathfrak{Q}]_{\delta^{(\rho)}} J$, where $J \subset Tm(b_0)$ and $\neg\delta_\iota \in \bigvee(b_0)$ by $\mathrm{rk}(\delta_\iota) < \mathrm{rk}(\delta) \leq b_0$. We have $\mathsf{k}(\iota) \subset M_\sigma$, and $\sigma \in L_\rho^{\mathfrak{Q}}(s, \Theta \cup \mathsf{k}(\iota))$ if $\sigma \in L$.

We see from $\sigma + 1 < \kappa \leq \mathsf{e}(\mathbb{S})$ that $\mathsf{d}^{\mathfrak{Q}_{b_0}^{[\sigma/\rho]}}(\mathbb{S}) \leq \mathsf{d}^{\mathfrak{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}}(\mathbb{S}) = \mathsf{e}(\mathbb{S})$. We obtain $h \lhd_{b_0} g$ by Proposition 3.37.3, and $m(\sigma) \lhd_{b_0} g$ by Proposition 3.37.5. IH yields $\left(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\kappa, \sigma) \cup \mathsf{k}(\iota), \mathfrak{Q}_{b_0}^{[\sigma/\rho]}\right) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{\varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a_0)} \Xi, \Gamma^{(\sigma)}, \neg(\delta_\iota)^{(\sigma)}$. A $(\bigwedge)$ yields $\left(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\kappa, \sigma) \cup \mathsf{k}(\iota), \mathfrak{Q}_{b_0}^{[\sigma/\rho]}\right) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{\varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a_0)+1} \Xi, \Gamma^{(\sigma)}, \neg\delta^{(\sigma)}$. We have $\left(\mathfrak{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}\right)^\sigma = \mathfrak{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]} \cup \{\sigma\} = \mathfrak{Q}_{b_0}^{[\sigma/\rho]} \cup \{\kappa\}$, and may assume $\partial\mathfrak{Q}_{b_0}^{[\sigma/\rho]}(\mathbb{S}) \subset \partial(\mathfrak{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]})^\sigma(\mathbb{S})$ when $b_0 \leq \mathbb{S}$ by $b \leq b_0$. We obtain even for $\mathrm{rk}(\delta) < b_0$

$$\left(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\kappa, \sigma), (\mathfrak{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]})^\sigma\right) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{\varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a_0)+1} \Xi, \Gamma^{(\sigma)}, \neg\delta^{(\sigma)} \tag{30}$$

On the other side, we see $\sigma \in H_\rho(d, f)$ from $\sigma \in H_\kappa(b, h)$, $b \leq b_0 < d$, $m(\kappa) \lhd_b g$ and $h'(b_0) < \alpha^{b_0}(g)$, and hence $\sigma \in H_\rho^{\mathfrak{Q}}(d, f, s, \Theta)$. IH yields

$$\left(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\kappa, \sigma), (\mathfrak{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]})^\sigma\right) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{\varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a_0)} \Xi, \Gamma^{(\kappa)}, \Delta^{(\sigma)} \tag{31}$$

We obtain $\left(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\kappa, \sigma), (\mathfrak{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]})^\sigma\right) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}+b_0+1}^{a_1} \Xi, \Gamma^{(\kappa)}, \Gamma^{(\sigma)}$ for $a_1 = \varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a_0) + p$ with a $p < \omega$ from (31) and (30) by several $(cut)^{(\cdot)}$'s of δ with $\mathrm{rk}(\delta) \leq b_0$. Cut-elimination 4.28 yields for $2b \leq a_2 = \varphi_{b_0+1}(a_1) < \varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a)$

$$\forall \sigma \in L \left[\left(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\kappa, \sigma), (\mathfrak{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]})^\sigma\right) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{a_2} \Xi, \Gamma^{(\kappa)}, \Gamma^{(\sigma)}\right] \tag{32}$$

Let $k = h^b(g; \varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a))$. Then $h_b = g_b = k_b$ and $h <^b k'(b)$ for $h = (h^{b_0}(g; \varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a_0))) * f^{b_0+1}$ by Proposition 3.37.3. On the other, Tautology 5.3 yields for each $\theta \in \Gamma$

$$\left(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\kappa), \mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}\right) \vdash_0^{2b} \Gamma^{(\kappa)}, \neg\theta^{(\kappa)} \tag{33}$$

By an inference rule $(\mathrm{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\kappa, b, h))$ with its resolvent class $L = H_\kappa^{\mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}}(b, h, s, \Theta_\kappa)$, we conclude (24) by (33), (32) with $\max\{2b, a_2\} < \varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a)$ and $\kappa < \mathtt{e}(\mathbb{S})$ when $b = c$. If $\max\{s(\kappa), s(h)\} \leq \mathbb{S}$, it suffices a single $\sigma = \sigma'$ such that $m(\sigma) = h$ with $SC_\Lambda(h) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$ for every $\mathbb{T} \leq \mathbb{S}$ and $\forall \mathbb{T} < \mathbb{S}(\sigma' \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathtt{R}}+\mathbb{I}}[(\Theta(\kappa))_{\mathtt{R}(\mathbb{T})}])$ for (23), and the inference $(\mathrm{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\kappa, b, h))$ is degenerated.

Case 2. Second consider the case when the last inference $(\bigvee)$ introduces a $\bigvee$-formula B: We may assume that $B \equiv A^{(\rho)} \in \Gamma^{(\rho)}$ with $A \simeq \bigvee (A_\iota)_{\iota \in J}$. We have $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{a_0} \Xi, \Gamma^{(\rho)}, (A_\iota)^{(\rho)}$, where $\iota \in [\rho]J$ and $A_\iota \simeq \bigwedge (B_\nu)_{\nu \in I}$ for $\bigvee$-formulas B_ν. When $\mathrm{rk}(A_\iota) \geq \mathbb{S}$, Inversion 4.15 followed by IH and a $(\bigwedge)$ yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\kappa), \mathtt{Q}_b^{[\kappa/\rho]}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{\varphi_{s(\rho)+1}(a_0)+1} \Xi, \Gamma^{(\kappa)}, (A_\iota)^{(\kappa)}$. This follows from IH if $\mathrm{rk}(A_\iota) < \mathbb{S}$. We obtain (24) by a $(\bigvee)$.

The cases when the last inference is one of $(\bigwedge)$, (cut) and $(\Sigma(\Omega)\text{-rfl})$ are seen from IH. □

Lemma 5.6 *Let $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^a_{\mathbb{S}, s, \mathbb{S}^\dagger, \gamma_0} \Xi$ with a finite family $\mathtt{Q} = ((\mathtt{Q})_0, \partial\mathtt{Q}, \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}, \mathtt{d})$ for $(\mathbb{S}^\dagger, \gamma_0)$, where $\mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathtt{Q})$ is a successor stable ordinal, $a < \Lambda$, $\partial\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) \neq \emptyset$ and $\Lambda > s \geq \mathbb{S}$. Let $\mathtt{Q}_1 = ((\mathtt{Q})_0, \partial\mathtt{Q}_1, \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}, \mathtt{d}_1)$ be a finite family for $(\mathbb{S}^\dagger, \gamma_0)$ such that $\partial\mathtt{Q}_1(\mathbb{U}) = \partial\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{U})$ and $\mathtt{d}_1(\mathbb{U}) = \mathtt{d}(\mathbb{U})$ for $\mathbb{U} < \mathbb{S}$, and $\partial\mathtt{Q}_1(\mathbb{S}) = \emptyset$, $\mathtt{d}_1(\mathbb{S}) = \max(\partial\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}))$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}_1) \vdash^{\varphi_{s+2}(a)}_{\mathbb{S}, s, \mathbb{S}^\dagger, \gamma_0} \Xi$ holds.*

Proof. By induction on a. We have $\partial\mathtt{Q}_1(\mathbb{S}) < \mathtt{d}_1(\mathbb{S})$ for (18). We have for every $\mathbb{T} < \mathbb{S}$, $\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathtt{Q}}+\mathbb{I}}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$ by (17). Hence $\mathtt{d}_1(\mathbb{S}) \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathtt{Q}}+\mathbb{I}}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$ for (17). In the proof let us omit the subscripts except the first one.

Consider the case when the last inference is a $(\mathrm{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho, d, f))$ with $s(\rho) \leq \mathbb{S} < s(f)$. Then $\rho \in \partial\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})$ by (r0), and $\rho \leq \mathtt{d}_1(\mathbb{S})$. Let $\Gamma^{(\rho)}$ be the set of capped formulas in Ξ with its cap ρ, and $\Xi_1 = \Xi \setminus \Gamma^{(\rho)}$. There is an ordinal $a_0 < a$ and a Δ such that $\mathrm{rk}(\Delta) < d \leq s(\rho) \leq \mathbb{S}$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{a_0} \Xi_1, \Gamma^{(\rho)}, \neg\delta^{(\rho)}$ for each $\delta \in \Delta$. IH yields

$$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}_1) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{\varphi_{s+2}(a_0)} \Xi_1, \Gamma^{(\rho)}, \neg\delta^{(\rho)} \tag{34}$$

Pick a $\sigma \in H_\rho^{\mathtt{Q}}(d, f, s, \Theta)$ such that $m(\sigma) = f$ and $\forall \mathbb{T} < \mathbb{S}(\sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathtt{Q}}+\mathbb{I}}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}])$. Such a σ exists since $\forall \mathbb{T} < \mathbb{S}(\rho \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}}^{\mathtt{Q}}+\mathbb{I}}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}])$ by (17). We obtain

$$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}, \mathtt{Q}^\sigma) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{a_0} \Xi_1, \Gamma^{(\rho)}, \Delta^{(\sigma)} \tag{35}$$

where $f_d = g_d$, $f^d <^d g'(d)$ and $\forall \mathbb{T} \leq \mathbb{S}(SC_\Lambda(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}])$ for $g = m(\rho)$. IH with (35) yields for $\sigma < \rho \leq \mathtt{d}_1(\mathbb{S})$

$$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma\}, \mathtt{Q}_1^\sigma) \vdash_{\mathbb{S}}^{\varphi_{s+2}(a_0)} \Xi_1, \Gamma^{(\rho)}, \Delta^{(\sigma)} \tag{36}$$

We have $\Delta \subset \bigvee_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathbb{S})$, $\varphi_{s+1}(\varphi_{s+2}(a_0)) = \varphi_{s+2}(a_0)$ and $\mathbb{S} < s(f) \leq s(\sigma) \leq s$.

Let $h = h^{\mathbb{S}}(f; \varphi_{s+2}(a_0))$. We see from $d \leq \mathbb{S}$ that $\forall \mathbb{T} \leq \mathbb{S}(SC_\Lambda(h) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}])$, $h_d = f_d = g_d$, and $h^d <^d g'(d)$ by Proposition 3.37.2. Pick a $\lambda \in L^{\mathtt{Q}}_\sigma(s, \Theta)$ such that $m(\lambda) = h$. We obtain $h \lhd_{\mathbb{S}} f$ by Proposition 3.37.6. Also $(\mathtt{Q}^\sigma_1)^{[\lambda/\sigma]}_{\mathbb{S}} = \mathtt{Q}^\lambda_1$ and $\partial((\mathtt{Q}^\sigma_1)^{[\lambda/\sigma]}_{\mathbb{S}}) = \partial\mathtt{Q}^\lambda_1$. We obtain by (36) and Recapping 5.5

$$(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta(\lambda) \cup \{\sigma\}, \mathtt{Q}^\lambda_1) \vdash^{\varphi_{s+2}(a_0)}_{\mathbb{S}} \Xi_1, \Gamma^{(\rho)}, \Delta^{(\lambda)} \tag{37}$$

where $\mathtt{d}^{(\mathtt{Q}^\sigma_1)^{[\lambda/\sigma]}_{\mathbb{S}}}(\mathbb{S}) = \mathtt{d}_1(\mathbb{S})$ by $\partial(\mathtt{Q}_1)(\mathbb{S}) = \emptyset$ and $\lambda + 1 < \rho \leq \mathtt{d}_1(\mathbb{S})$, and $\partial(\mathtt{Q}^\lambda_1)(\mathbb{S}) \subset \{\lambda\}$. A degenerated $(\mathrm{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho, d, h))$ with (34), (37), $\max\{s(\rho), s(h)\} \leq \mathbb{S}$ yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}_1) \vdash^{\varphi_{s+2}(a)}_{\mathbb{S}} \Xi_1, \Gamma^{(\rho)}$, where $\forall \mathbb{T} < \mathbb{S}(\lambda' = \sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}}+\mathbb{I}}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}])$ for (23). Other cases are seen from SIH. □

5.2 Eliminations of inferences (rfl)

In this subsection, inferences $(\mathrm{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho, d, f))$ are removed from operator controlled derivations of sequents of formulas in $\Sigma(\Omega) \cup \Pi(\Omega)$.

Definition 5.7 We define the *S-rank* $\mathrm{srk}(A^{(\rho)})$ of a capped formula $A^{(\rho)}$ as follows. Let $\mathrm{srk}(\rho) = \mathbb{S} \in SSt$ for $\rho \in \Psi_{\mathbb{S}}$. Let $\mathrm{srk}(A^{(\mathfrak{u})}) = 0$, and $\mathrm{srk}(A^{(\rho)}) = \mathrm{srk}(\rho)$. $\mathrm{srk}(\Gamma) = \max\{\mathrm{srk}(A^{(\rho)}) : A^{(\rho)} \in \Gamma\}$.

Lemma 5.8 *Suppose* $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^a_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_0} \Xi$ *with* $a < \Lambda$ *and a finite family* $\mathtt{Q} = ((\mathtt{Q})_0, \partial\mathtt{Q}, \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_\cdot, \mathtt{d})$ *for* $(\mathbb{S}^\dagger, \gamma_0)$*, where* $\mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathtt{Q})$ *and* $\mathrm{srk}(\Xi) < \mathbb{S}$.

Then there exists a finite family $\mathtt{R} = ((\mathtt{R})_0, \partial\mathtt{R}, \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_\cdot, \mathtt{d})$ *for* $(\mathbb{S}^\dagger, \gamma_0)$ *such that* $\partial\mathtt{R}(\mathbb{S}) = \emptyset$, $\forall \rho \in \mathtt{R}(\mathbb{S})(s(\rho) \leq \mathbb{S})$, *and* $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_{\mathtt{R}}, \mathtt{R}) \vdash^{\tilde{a}}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_0} \Xi$ *holds, where* $\Theta_{\mathtt{R}} = \Theta \cup (\mathtt{R}(\mathbb{S}) \setminus \mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}))$ *and* $\tilde{a} = \varphi_{s+3}(a)$.

Proof. Let $\{\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_n\} = \{\rho \in \mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) : s(\rho) > \mathbb{S}\}$, $\alpha_1 = \varphi_{s(\rho_1)+1}(a)$ and $\alpha_{i+1} = \varphi_{s(\rho_{i+1})+1}(\alpha_i)$ for $0 < i < n$, where $s(\rho_i) \leq s < \Lambda$. Let us define Θ_i, κ_i and $\mathtt{R}_i$ recursively by $\Theta_i = \Theta \cup \{\kappa_j : j \leq i\}$, $\mathtt{R}_0 = \mathtt{Q}$, $\mathtt{R}_i = (\mathtt{R}_{i-1})^{[\kappa_i/\rho_i]}_{\mathbb{S}}$, and $\kappa_i \in L^{\mathtt{R}_{i-1}}_{\rho_i}(\Theta_i)$ for $0 < i \leq n$, where $m(\kappa_i) = h^{\mathbb{S}}(m(\rho_i); \alpha_i)$.

We obtain $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_n, \mathtt{R}_n) \vdash^{\alpha_n}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_0} \Xi$ by Recapping 5.5, where $\forall \kappa \in \mathtt{R}_n(\mathbb{S})(s(\kappa) \leq \mathbb{S})$ and $\partial(\mathtt{R}_n)(\mathbb{S}) = \mathtt{R}_n(\mathbb{S}) = \partial\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) \cup \{\kappa_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$.

We may assume $\partial(\mathtt{R}_n)(\mathbb{S}) \neq \emptyset$. Lemma 5.6 yields $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta_n, \mathtt{R}) \vdash^{a_1}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_0} \Xi$, where $\mathtt{R}(\mathbb{S}) = \mathtt{R}_n(\mathbb{S})$, $\partial\mathtt{R}(\mathbb{S}) = \emptyset$, and $a_1 = \varphi_{s+2}(\alpha_n) < \varphi_{s+3}(a) = \tilde{a}$. □

Lemma 5.9 (Elimination of one stable ordinal)
Suppose $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^a_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_0} \Xi, \Gamma^{(\cdot)}$ *with a finite family* $\mathtt{Q} = ((\mathtt{Q})_0, \partial\mathtt{Q}, \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_\cdot, \mathtt{d})$ *for* $(\mathbb{S}^\dagger, \gamma_0)$*, where* $a < \Lambda$, $\mathbb{S} \in dom(\mathtt{Q})$, $\Lambda > s \geq \mathbb{S}$, $\mathrm{srk}(\Xi) < \mathbb{S}$, $\Gamma = \bigcup\{\Gamma_\rho : \rho \in \mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})\} \subset \Delta_0(\mathbb{S})$ *and* $\Gamma^{(\cdot)} = \bigcup\{\Gamma^{(\rho)}_\rho : \rho \in \mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})\}$.

Assume $\partial\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}) = \emptyset$ *and* $\forall \rho \in \mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})(s(\rho) \leq \mathbb{S})$. *Let* $\gamma_1 = \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}} + \mathbb{I}$ *and* $\hat{a} = \varphi_{s+2+\mathtt{d}(\mathbb{S})}(a)$. *Then* $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{\hat{a}}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S},\gamma_1} \Xi, \Gamma$ *holds.*

Proof. By main induction on $\mathtt{d}(\mathbb{S})$ with subsidiary induction on a. Note that $\mathtt{Q}$ is a finite family for $(\mathbb{S},\gamma_1)$, and neither of $[\mathtt{Q}]_{A^{(\rho)}}J$, $L^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\rho}(s,\Theta)$ and $H^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\rho}(d,f,s,\Theta)$ depend on the second subscripts $\mathbb{S}^{\dagger},\mathbb{S}$. For every $\mathbb{T}<\mathbb{S}$, we have $\{a,s\}\subset\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$ by (21), and $\mathtt{d}(\mathbb{S})\in\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$ by (17). Hence $\hat{a}\in\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$, and (20) is enjoyed in $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1},\Theta,\mathtt{Q})\vdash^{\hat{a}}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S},\gamma_1}\Xi,\Gamma$. Also we obtain by (20) and (21), $\mathtt{k}^{\mathbb{T}}(\Xi\cup\Gamma)\cup\{\gamma_1,a\}\subset\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$.

Case 1. $\{\neg A^{(\rho)},A^{(\rho)}\}\subset\Gamma^{(\cdot)}$ for a formula A with $\mathrm{rk}(A)<\mathbb{S}$: We obtain $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1},\Theta,\mathtt{Q})\vdash^{\mathbb{S}}_{0,s,\mathbb{S},\gamma_1}\Xi,\Gamma$ by Tautology 5.3.

Case 2. The last inference is a $(\mathrm{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho,d,f))$: Then $s(\rho)\leq\mathbb{S}$ by the assumption $\forall\rho\in\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})(s(\rho)\leq\mathbb{S})$, and $s(f)\leq\mathbb{S}$ by $\partial\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S})=\emptyset$ and (r0). This means that the inference is degenerated. We have an ordinal $a_0<a$ and a sequent Δ such that $\mathrm{rk}(\Delta)<d\leq s(\rho)\leq\mathbb{S}$, $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma},\Theta,\mathtt{Q})\vdash^{a_0}_{\mathbb{S},\mathbb{S}^{\dagger},\gamma_0}\Xi,\neg\delta^{(\rho)},\Gamma^{(\cdot)}$ for each $\delta\in\Delta$, and $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma},\Theta\cup\{\sigma,\sigma'\},\mathtt{Q}^{\sigma})\vdash^{a_0}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S}^{\dagger},\gamma_0}\Xi,\Delta^{(\sigma)},\Gamma^{(\cdot)}$ for a σ and a σ' such that $\forall\mathbb{T}<\mathbb{S}(\sigma'\in\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}])$ by (23). SIH yields for $\widehat{a_0}=\varphi_{s+2+\mathtt{d}(\mathbb{S})}(a_0)$

$$(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1},\Theta,\mathtt{Q})\vdash^{\widehat{a_0}}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S},\gamma_1}\Xi,\Gamma,\neg\delta \tag{38}$$

On the other hand we have $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma},\Theta\cup\{\sigma,\sigma'\},\mathtt{Q}^{\sigma})\vdash^{a_0}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S}^{\dagger},\gamma_0}\Xi,\Gamma^{(\cdot)},\Delta^{(\sigma)}$ for a $\sigma\in L^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\rho}(s,\Theta)$, where $s(m(\sigma))=s(f)\leq\mathbb{S}$, $\forall\mathbb{T}<\mathbb{S}(\{\sigma,\sigma'\}\subset\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}])$ by (17) and (23), and $\partial\mathtt{Q}^{\sigma}(\mathbb{S})\subset\{\sigma\}$. If $\partial\mathtt{Q}^{\sigma}(\mathbb{S})=\emptyset$, SIH yields

$$(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1},\Theta,\mathtt{Q}^{\sigma})\vdash^{\widehat{a_0}}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S},\gamma_1}\Xi,\Gamma,\Delta \tag{39}$$

Assume $\sigma\in\partial\mathtt{Q}^{\sigma}(\mathbb{S})$. Then $\sigma<\mathtt{d}(\mathbb{S})$ by (18). We obtain by Lemma 5.6, $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma},\Theta\cup\{\sigma,\sigma'\},\mathtt{Q}^{\sigma}_1)\vdash^{\varphi_{s+2}(a_0)}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S}^{\dagger},\gamma_0}\Xi,\Gamma^{(\cdot)},\Delta^{(\sigma)}$, where $\partial(\mathtt{Q}^{\sigma}_1)(\mathbb{S})=\emptyset$, $\varphi_{s+2}(a_0)\leq\varphi_{s+2+\mathtt{d}(\mathbb{S})}(a_0)=\widehat{a_0}$ and $\mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{Q}_1}(\mathbb{S})=\max(\partial\mathtt{Q}^{\sigma})(\mathbb{S})=\sigma<\mathtt{d}(\mathbb{S})$. MIH then yields (39) for $\varphi_{s+2+\mathtt{d}^{\mathtt{Q}_1}(\mathbb{S})}(\widehat{a_0})=\widehat{a_0}$. We obtain by several (cut)'s of (38) and (39) for $\mathrm{rk}(\delta)<\mathbb{S}$, $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1},\Theta,\mathtt{Q})\vdash^{\hat{a}}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S},\gamma_1}\Xi,\Gamma$.

Case 3. The last inference is a $(\bigwedge)$: There are $\rho\in\{\mathtt{u}\}\cup\bigcup_{\mathbb{S}^{\dagger}}\mathtt{Q}$, a formula $A\simeq\bigwedge(A_{\iota})_{\iota\in J}$ with $A^{(\rho)}\in\Xi\cup\Gamma^{(\cdot)}$, and ordinals $a(\iota)<a$ for each $\iota\in[\mathtt{Q}]_{A^{(\rho)}}J$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma},\Theta\cup\mathtt{k}(\iota),\mathtt{Q})\vdash^{a(\iota)}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S}^{\dagger},\gamma_0}\Xi,A^{(\rho)}_{\iota},\Gamma^{(\cdot)}$. SIH yields for $\widehat{a(\iota)}=\varphi_{s+2+\mathtt{d}(\mathbb{S})}(a(\iota))$ $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1},\Theta\cup\mathtt{k}(\iota),\mathtt{Q})\vdash^{\widehat{a(\iota)}}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S},\gamma_1}\Xi,A_{\iota},\Gamma$ for each $\iota\in[\mathtt{Q}]_{A^{(\rho)}}J$.

First let $A^{(\rho)}\in\Gamma^{(\cdot)}$. We obtain $\mathtt{k}(A)\subset\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}[\Theta^{(\rho)}]$ by (19), and $\mathtt{k}(A)\subset M_{\rho}\cap\mathbb{S}=\rho$ by $A\in\Delta_0(\mathbb{S})$. Hence $[\mathtt{Q}]_{A^{(\rho)}}J=[\mathtt{Q}]_AJ\cap[\rho]J=[\mathtt{Q}]_AJ$. A $(\bigwedge)$ yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1},\Theta,\mathtt{Q})\vdash^{\hat{a}}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S},\gamma_1}\Xi,\Gamma$ with $A\in\Gamma$. Second let $A^{(\rho)}\in\Xi$. We obtain $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1},\Theta,\mathtt{Q})\vdash^{\hat{a}}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S},\gamma_1}\Xi,\Gamma$ by a $(\bigwedge)$ for $A^{(\rho)}\in\Xi$.

Other cases $(\mathrm{rfl}_{\mathbb{T}}(\rho,d,f))$ with $\mathbb{T}<\mathbb{S}$, $(cut),(\bigvee)$ and $(\Sigma-\mathrm{rfl})$ on Ω are seen from SIH. □

Definition 5.10 Let $\mathtt{Q}=((\mathtt{Q})_0,\partial\mathtt{Q},\gamma^{\mathtt{Q}},\mathtt{d})$ be a finite family for (e,γ_0), and $\mathbb{W}<e$ a successor stable ordinal. $\delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{W}}$ denotes an ordinal defined as follows. If $[\mathbb{W},e)\cap dom(\mathtt{Q})=\emptyset$, then $\delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{W}}=\gamma_0$. Otherwise $\delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{W}}=\gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{U}}$ for the least $\mathbb{U}\in[\mathbb{W},e)\cap dom(\mathtt{Q})$.

Proposition 5.11 *Let* $\mathtt{Q} = ((\mathtt{Q})_0, \partial\mathtt{Q}, \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\cdot}, \mathtt{d})$ *be a finite family for* (e, γ_0)*, and* $\mathbb{W} < \mathbb{S} < e$ *successor stable ordinals. Then* $\delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}} \leq \delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{W}}$.

Proof. If $[\mathbb{W}, e) \cap dom(\mathtt{Q}) = \emptyset$, then $\delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{W}} = \delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}} = \gamma_0$. Otherwise $\delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{W}} = \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{U}}$ for the least $\mathbb{U} \in [\mathbb{W}, e) \cap dom(\mathtt{Q})$. If $\mathbb{S} \leq \mathbb{U}$, then $\delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}} = \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{U}}$. Assume $\mathbb{U} < \mathbb{S}$. If $[\mathbb{S}, e) \cap dom(\mathtt{Q}) = \emptyset$, then $\delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}} = \gamma_0 < \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{U}}$ by Definition 4.22.2c. Otherwise let $\delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}} = \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{T}}$ for the least $\mathbb{T} \in [\mathbb{S}, e) \cap dom(\mathtt{Q})$. Then $\mathbb{U} < \mathbb{T}$, and $\gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{T}} < \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{U}}$ by Definition 4.22.2c. □

Lemma 5.12 (Elimination of stable ordinals)
Let $\mathtt{Q} = ((\mathtt{Q})_0, \partial\mathtt{Q}, \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\cdot}, \mathtt{d})$ *be a finite family for* (e, γ_0)*, where* e *is a stable ordinal. Suppose* $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{a}_{e,s,e,\gamma_0} \Xi$ *and* $\mathrm{srk}(\Xi) < \mathbb{W} < e < \Lambda$*, where* $a, s < \Lambda$*,* $\mathbb{W} = \mathbb{V}^\dagger$ *is a successor stable ordinal such that* $\forall \mathbb{U} \leq \mathbb{W}(\mathbb{W} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{U})}])$.

Let $f(e, a) = \varphi_{s+e+1}(a)$ *and* $\gamma_{\mathbb{W}} = \delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{W}} + \mathbb{I} \cdot (f(e, a)) < \gamma_0 + \mathbb{I}^2$*. Assume that* $\mathtt{Q}$ *has gaps* $f(e, a) + 1$*. Then* $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{W}}}, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{f(e,a)}_{\mathbb{W},s,\mathbb{W},\gamma_{\mathbb{W}}} \Xi$ *holds.*

Proof. By main induction on e with subsidiary induction on a. By the assumption, $\mathtt{Q}$ is a finite family for $(\mathbb{W}, \gamma_{\mathbb{W}})$, cf. Definition 4.22.2c.

By (20) and (21) we have $\forall \mathbb{U} < \mathbb{W}(\{\mathbb{W}, e, a, \gamma_{\mathbb{W}}\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{U})}])$ for (20).
Case 1. Consider the case when the last inference is a $(\mathrm{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho, d, f))$ for a $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{T}^\dagger < e$. Let $\mathbb{S} \in dom_e(\mathtt{P})$ for $\mathtt{P} = \mathtt{Q} \cup \{(\mathbb{S}, \rho)\}$. Let $a_0 < a$ be an ordinal, and Δ be a finite set of formulas such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{P}) \vdash^{a_0}_{e,s,e,\gamma_0} \Xi, \neg\delta^{(\rho)}$ for each $\delta \in \Delta$. When the inference is non-degenerated, we have $\forall \sigma \in L \left[(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{P}^\sigma) \vdash^{a_0}_{e,s,e,\gamma_0} \Xi, \Delta^{(\sigma)}\right]$ for $L = H^{\mathtt{P}}_\rho(f, s, \Theta)$. If it is degenerated, we have $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta \cup \{\sigma, \sigma'\}, \mathtt{P}^\sigma) \vdash^{a_0}_{e,s,e,\gamma_0} \Xi, \Delta^{(\sigma)}$ for some $\sigma \in L^{\mathtt{P}}_\rho(s, \Theta)$ and $\sigma \leq \sigma' < \rho$ such that $m(\sigma) = f$, $\forall \mathbb{T} \leq \mathbb{S}(SC_\Lambda(m(\sigma')) \subset \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{P}(\mathbb{T})}])$ and $\forall \mathbb{T} < \mathbb{S}\left(\sigma' \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma^{\mathtt{P}}_{\mathbb{S}} + \mathbb{I}}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]\right)$. Since $(f(e, a_0) + 1) \cdot 2 < f(e, a)$, we may assume that the finite family $\mathtt{P}$ for (e, γ_0) has gaps $f(e, a_0) + 1$. Let $a_1 = f(e, a_0)$.
Case 1.1. $\mathbb{S} < \mathbb{W}$: SIH yields, $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{W}}}, \Theta, \mathtt{P}) \vdash^{a_1}_{\mathbb{W},s,\mathbb{W},\gamma_{\mathbb{W}}} \Xi, \neg\delta^{\rho)}$ for each $\delta \in \Delta$, and either $\forall \sigma \in L \left[(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{W}}}, \Theta, \mathtt{P}^\sigma) \vdash^{a_1}_{\mathbb{W},s,\mathbb{W},\gamma_{\mathbb{W}}} \Xi, \Delta^{(\sigma)}\right]$ or $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{W}}}, \Theta \cup \{\sigma, \sigma'\}, \mathtt{P}^\sigma) \vdash^{a_1}_{\mathbb{W},s,\mathbb{W},\gamma_{\mathbb{W}}} \Xi, \Delta^{(\sigma)}$. $(\mathrm{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho, d, f))$ yields the lemma.
Case 1.2. $\mathbb{W} \leq \mathbb{S}$: We have $\mathrm{srk}(\delta^{(\rho)}) = \mathrm{srk}(\Delta^{(\sigma)}) = \mathbb{S} < \mathbb{S}^\dagger \leq e \in St$. By (21) we have for every $\mathbb{U} \leq \mathbb{S}$, $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$, and $\mathbb{S}^\dagger \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{T})}]$. Let $\gamma_{\mathbb{S}\dagger} = \delta^{\mathtt{P}}_{\mathbb{S}\dagger} + \mathbb{I} \cdot a_1$. By SIH we obtain $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}\dagger}}, \Theta, \mathtt{P}) \vdash^{a_1}_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger,s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_{\mathbb{S}\dagger}} \Xi, \neg\delta^{(\rho)}$ for each $\delta \in \Delta$, and either $\forall \sigma \in L \left[(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}\dagger}}, \Theta, \mathtt{P}^\sigma) \vdash^{a_1}_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger,s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_{\mathbb{S}\dagger}} \Xi, \Delta^{(\sigma)}\right]$ or $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}\dagger}}, \Theta \cup \{\sigma, \sigma'\}, \mathtt{P}^\sigma) \vdash^{a_1}_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger,s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_{\mathbb{S}\dagger}} \Xi, \Delta^{(\sigma)}$. A $(\mathrm{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho, d, f))$ yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}\dagger}}, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{a_1+1}_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger,s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_{\mathbb{S}\dagger}} \Xi$.

We obtain $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}\dagger}}, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{a_2}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_{\mathbb{S}\dagger}} \Xi$ for $a_2 = \varphi_{\mathbb{S}\dagger}(a_1 + 1)$ by Cut-elimination 4.28 with $dom(\mathtt{Q}) \cap (\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{S}^\dagger) = \emptyset$.

By Lemma 5.8, there exists a finite family $\mathtt{R} = ((\mathtt{R})_0, \partial\mathtt{R}, \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\cdot}, \mathtt{d})$ for $(\mathbb{S}^\dagger, \gamma_{\mathbb{S}\dagger})$ such that $\partial\mathtt{R}(\mathbb{S}) = \emptyset$, $\forall \rho \in \mathtt{R}(\mathbb{S})(s(\rho) \leq \mathbb{S})$, and $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}\dagger}}, \Theta_{\mathtt{R}}, \mathtt{R}) \vdash^{a_3}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_{\mathbb{S}\dagger}} \Xi$ holds, where $\Theta_{\mathtt{R}} = \Theta \cup (\mathtt{R}(\mathbb{S}) \setminus \mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{S}))$ such that $\forall \mathbb{U} < \mathbb{S}(\mathtt{R}(\mathbb{S}) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}\dagger}+\mathbb{I}}[\Theta_{\mathtt{Q}(\mathbb{U})}])$ and $a_3 = \varphi_{s+3}(a_2)$. Let $\gamma_1 = \gamma_{\mathbb{S}\dagger} + \mathbb{I}$. Lemma 5.9 then yields

$$(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_1}, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}_1) \vdash^{a_4}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S},\gamma_1} \Xi \tag{40}$$

where $a_4 = \varphi_{s+2+\mathtt{d}(\mathbb{S})}(a_3) < f(e,a)$ by $\mathtt{d}(\mathbb{S}) < \mathbb{S} < \mathbb{S}^\dagger \leq e$. $\mathtt{Q}_1 = ((\mathtt{Q})_0, \partial\mathtt{Q}_1, \gamma_\cdot^{\mathtt{Q}_1}, \mathtt{d}_1)$ is a finite family for $(\mathbb{S}, \gamma_1)$, where each of $\partial\mathtt{Q}_1, \gamma_\cdot^{\mathtt{Q}_1}, \mathtt{d}_1$ is the restriction of $\partial\mathtt{Q}, \gamma_\cdot^{\mathtt{Q}}, \mathtt{d}$ to $dom_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathtt{Q})$, resp.

We claim that $\delta^{\mathtt{P}}_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger} \leq \delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{W}}$ for finite families $\mathtt{Q}, \mathtt{P}$ for (e, γ_0). If $\mathbb{S} \notin dom(\mathtt{Q})$, then $\delta^{\mathtt{P}}_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger} = \delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}}$. Otherwise $\delta^{\mathtt{P}}_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger} = \delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger}$. By $\mathbb{W} \leq \mathbb{S} < \mathbb{S}^\dagger$ and Proposition 5.11 we obtain $\delta^{\mathtt{P}}_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger} \leq \delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{W}}$.

First let $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{W}$. We obtain $\gamma_1 = \delta^{\mathtt{P}}_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger} + \mathbb{I} \cdot (a_1 + 1) < \delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{W}} + \mathbb{I} \cdot (f(e,a)) = \gamma_{\mathbb{W}}$ by the claim and $a_1 + 1 < f(e,a)$, and we are done by (40).

Let $\mathbb{W} < \mathbb{S} < e$. We obtain $a_5 = f(\mathbb{S}, a_4) = \varphi_{s+\mathbb{S}+1}(a_4) < \varphi_{s+e+1}(a) = f(e,a)$ by $a_4 < f(e,a)$ and $\mathbb{S} < \mathbb{S}^\dagger \leq e$. We see from this that the finite family $\mathtt{Q}_1$ for $(\mathbb{S}, \gamma_1)$ has gaps $f(e,a) = f(e,a) - (f(e,a_0)+1) > a_5 + 1$. Let $\gamma_2 = \delta^{\mathtt{Q}_1}_{\mathbb{W}} + \mathbb{I} \cdot a_5$. Then by MIH with (40) we obtain $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_2}, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{a_5}_{\mathbb{W},s,\mathbb{W},\gamma_2} \Xi$.

It remains to show $\gamma_2 < \gamma_{\mathbb{W}}$. If $[\mathbb{W}, \mathbb{S}) \cap dom(\mathtt{Q}) = \emptyset$, then $\delta^{\mathtt{Q}_1}_{\mathbb{W}} = \gamma_1 = \delta^{\mathtt{P}}_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger} + \mathbb{I}(a_1 + 1)$, where $\delta^{\mathtt{P}}_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger} \leq \delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{W}}$ by the claim. Otherwise $\delta^{\mathtt{Q}_1}_{\mathbb{W}} = \gamma^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{U}} = \delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{W}}$ for the least $\mathbb{U} \in [\mathbb{W}, \mathbb{S}) \cap dom(\mathtt{Q})$. In each case $\gamma_2 < \gamma_{\mathbb{W}}$ follows from $a_1 + 1 + a_5 < f(e,a)$.

Case 2. Next consider the case when the last inference is a (cut) of a cut formula $C^{(\sigma)}$ wth $\max\{\mathrm{rk}(C), \mathrm{srk}(\sigma)\} < e$. We have an ordinal $a_0 < a$ such that $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{a_0}_{e,s,e,\gamma_0} \neg C^{(\sigma)}, \Xi$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\gamma, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{a_0}_{e,s,e,\gamma_0} C^{(\sigma)}, \Xi$.

Let $\mathbb{S}^\dagger = \max\{\mathbb{W}, \mathrm{rk}(C)^\dagger, (\mathrm{srk}(\sigma))^\dagger\} \leq e$, and $\gamma_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger} = \delta^{\mathtt{Q}}_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger} + \mathbb{I} \cdot a_1$. SIH yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger}}, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}_1) \vdash^{a_1}_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger,s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger}} \neg C^{(\sigma)}, \Xi$ and $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger}}, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}_1) \vdash^{a_1}_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger,s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger}} C^{(\sigma)}, \Xi$, where $a_1 = f(e, a_0) = \varphi_{s+e+1}(a_0)$ and $\mathtt{Q}_1$ is a finite family for $(\mathbb{S}^\dagger, \gamma_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger})$. A (cut) yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger}}, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{a_1+1}_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger,s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger}} \Xi$. If $\mathbb{S}^\dagger = \mathbb{W}$, then we are done. Assume $\mathbb{W} < \mathbb{S}^\dagger$. Then $\mathbb{W} \leq \mathbb{S} \in St$.

Case 2.1. $\mathbb{S} \in \{\Omega\} \cup LSt$: Cut-elimination 4.28 with $dom(\mathtt{Q}) \cap (\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{S}^\dagger) = \emptyset$ yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger}}, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{a_2}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger}} \Xi$ for $a_2 = \varphi_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger}(a_1 + 1)$. Let $a_3 = f(\mathbb{S}, a_2) = \varphi_{s+\mathbb{S}+1}(a_2) < \varphi_{s+e+1}(a) = f(e,a)$ by $\mathbb{S} < \mathbb{S}^\dagger \leq e$. We see $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger}}, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}_1) \vdash^{a_2}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S},\gamma_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger}} \Xi$ from $dom_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger}(\mathtt{Q}) = dom_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathtt{Q})$ for $\mathbb{S} \in \{\Omega\} \cup LSt$, and $\mathtt{Q}_1$ is a finite family for $(\mathbb{S}, \gamma_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger})$, which has gaps $f(e,a) > a_3 + 1$. Moreover we see $\delta^{\mathtt{Q}_1}_{\mathbb{W}} + \mathbb{I} \cdot a_3 < \gamma_{\mathbb{W}}$. By MIH with $\mathbb{S} < e$ we obtain $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{W}}}, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{a_3}_{\mathbb{W},s,\mathbb{W},\gamma_{\mathbb{W}}} \Xi$.

Case 2.2. $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{T}^\dagger \in SSt$: Cut-elimination 4.28 with $dom(\mathtt{Q}) \cap (\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{S}^\dagger) = \emptyset$ yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger}}, \Theta, \mathtt{Q}) \vdash^{a_2}_{\mathbb{S},s,\mathbb{S}^\dagger,\gamma_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger}} \Xi$, where $a_2 = \varphi_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger}(a_1 + 1) < \varphi_{s+e+1}(a) = f(e,a)$.

As in **Case 1.2**, we obtain (40) by Lemmas 5.8 and 5.9 with $a_3 = \varphi_{s+3}(a_2)$, $a_4 = \varphi_{s+2+\mathtt{d}(\mathbb{S})}(a_3) < f(e,a)$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_{\mathbb{S}^\dagger} + \mathbb{I}$. We see $\gamma_1, \delta^{\mathtt{Q}_1}_{\mathbb{W}} + \mathbb{I} \cdot a_5 < \gamma_{\mathbb{W}}$ for $a_5 = f(\mathbb{S}, a_4) = \varphi_{s+\mathbb{S}+1}(a_4) < \varphi_{s+e+1}(a) = f(e,a)$ and the lemma as in **Case 1.2**. When $\mathbb{W} < \mathbb{S} < e$, the lemma follows from MIH.

Other cases $(\bigvee), (\bigwedge)$ and $(\Sigma{-}\mathrm{rfl})$ on Ω are seen from SIH. □

Let us prove Theorem 1.1. Let $S_{\mathbb{I}} \vdash \theta^{L_\Omega}$ for a Σ-sentence θ. By Embedding 4.14 pick an $m > 0$ so that $(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{I}}, \emptyset; \emptyset) \vdash^{*\mathbb{I}\cdot 2+m}_{\mathbb{I}+m} \theta^{L_\Omega}; \emptyset$. Cut-elimination 4.18 yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{I}}, \emptyset; \emptyset) \vdash^{*a}_{\mathbb{I}} \theta^{L_\Omega}; \emptyset$ for $a = \omega_m(\mathbb{I} \cdot 2 + m) < \omega_{m+1}(\mathbb{I} + 1)$. Then Collapsing 4.20 yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\hat{a}+1}, \emptyset; \emptyset) \vdash^{*\beta}_{\beta} \theta^{L_\Omega}; \emptyset$ for $\beta = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(\hat{a}) \in LS$ with $\hat{a} = \omega^{\mathbb{I}+a} = \omega_{m+1}(\mathbb{I} \cdot 2 + m) > \beta$. Capping 5.1 then yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_0}, \emptyset, \emptyset) \vdash^{\beta}_{\beta,\beta,\beta,\gamma_0} \theta^{L_\Omega}$ where $\gamma_0 = \hat{a} + 1$, $\theta^{L_\Omega} \equiv (\theta^{L_\Omega})^{(\mathfrak{u})}$, and $\emptyset$ is a finite family for (β, γ_0).

Now let $\beta < \Lambda = \Gamma(\beta) < \mathbb{I}$ be the next strongly critical number as the base of the $\tilde{\theta}$-function. In what follows each finite function is an $f : \Lambda \to \Gamma(\Lambda)$. Let $\alpha = \varphi_{\beta\cdot 2+1}(\beta)$ and the least stable ordinal $\mathbb{S}_0 = \Omega^\dagger$. By Lemma 5.12 we obtain $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}_0}}, \emptyset, \emptyset) \vdash^{\alpha}_{\mathbb{S}_0,\beta,\mathbb{S}_0,\gamma_{\mathbb{S}_0}} \theta^{L_\Omega}$ for $\gamma_{\mathbb{S}_0} = \delta^{\emptyset}_{\mathbb{S}_0} + \mathbb{I}\cdot f(\beta,\beta) = \gamma_0 + \mathbb{I}\cdot\alpha < \gamma_0 + \mathbb{I}^2$. Cut-elimination 4.28 yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}_0}}, \emptyset, \emptyset) \vdash^{\alpha_1}_{\Omega,\beta,\mathbb{S}_0,\gamma_{\mathbb{S}_0}} \theta^{L_\Omega}$ for $\alpha_1 = \varphi_{\mathbb{S}_0}(\alpha)$.

In a witnessed derivation of this fact, there occurs no (degenerated or non-degenerated) inference $(\mathrm{rfl}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho, e, f))$ nor no (Taut) since there is no successor stable ordinal $\mathbb{S} < \mathbb{S}_0$, cf. Definition 4.24. Hence $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma_{\mathbb{S}_0}}, \emptyset; \emptyset) \vdash^{*\alpha_1}_{\Omega,\gamma_{\mathbb{S}_0}} \theta^{L_\Omega}; \emptyset$. $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \emptyset; \emptyset) \vdash^{*\delta}_{\delta,\gamma_{\mathbb{S}_0}} \theta^{L_\delta}; \emptyset$ follows from Collapsing 4.21 for $\gamma = \gamma_{\mathbb{S}_0} + \alpha_1 + 1$ and $\delta = \psi_\Omega(\gamma_{\mathbb{S}_0} + \alpha_1)$ with the epsilon number α_1. Cut-elimination 4.18 yields $(\mathcal{H}_{\gamma}, \emptyset; \emptyset) \vdash^{*\varphi_\delta(\delta)}_{0,\gamma_{\mathbb{S}_0}} \theta^{L_\delta}; \emptyset$. We see that θ^{L_δ} is true by induction up to $\varphi_\delta(\delta)$, where $\delta < \psi_\Omega(\omega_{m+2}(\mathbb{I}+1)) < \psi_\Omega(\varepsilon_{\mathbb{I}+1})$.

6 Some ordinals in well-foundedness proof

In this section we introduce some ordinals needed in well-foundedness proof.

In [1] the following Lemmas 6.2 and 6.3 are shown. Lemma 6.2 is used in showing the finiteness of the sequence $\rho_0 \succ \rho_1 \succ \rho_2 \succ \cdots$, cf. Definition 3.21 and Lemma 6.13. Lemma 6.3 is needed in showing Corollary 7.39.

Definition 6.1 Let $\Lambda \leq \mathbb{I}$ be a strongly critical number.

1. For $\xi < \varphi_\Lambda(0)$, $a_\Lambda(\xi)$ denotes an ordinal defined recursively by $a_\Lambda(0) = 0$, and $a_\Lambda(\xi) = \sum_{i\leq m} \tilde{\theta}_{b_i}(\omega \cdot a_\Lambda(\xi_i); \Lambda)$ when $\xi =_{NF} \sum_{i\leq m} \tilde{\theta}_{b_i}(\xi_i; \Lambda)$ in (4).
2. For irreducible functions $f : \Lambda \to \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ with base Λ let us associate ordinals $o_\Lambda(f) < \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ as follows. $o_\Lambda(\emptyset) = 0$ for the empty function $f = \emptyset$. Let $\{0\} \cup \mathrm{supp}(f) = \{0 = c_0 < c_1 < \cdots < c_n\}$, $f(c_i) = \xi_i < \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ for $i > 0$, and $\xi_0 = 0$. Define ordinals $\zeta_i = o_\Lambda(f; c_i)$ by $\zeta_n = \omega\cdot a_\Lambda(\xi_n)$, and $\zeta_i = \omega \cdot a_\Lambda(\xi_i) + \tilde{\theta}_{c_{i+1}-c_i}(\zeta_{i+1} + 1; \Lambda)$. Finally let $o_\Lambda(f) = \zeta_0 = o_\Lambda(f; c_0)$.
3. For $d \notin \{0\} \cup \mathrm{supp}(f)$, let $o_\Lambda(f; d) = 0$ if $f^d = \emptyset$. Otherwise $o_\Lambda(f; d) = \tilde{\theta}_{c-d}(o_\Lambda(f; c) + 1; \Lambda)$ for $c = \min(\mathrm{supp}(f^d))$.

Lemma 6.2 *Let $f : \Lambda \to \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ be an irreducible finite function with base Λ defined from an irreducible function $g : \Lambda \to \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ and ordinals c, d as follows. $f_c = g_{\underline{c}}$, $c < d \in \mathrm{supp}(g)$ with $(c,d) \cap \mathrm{supp}(g) = (c,d) \cap \mathrm{supp}(f) = \emptyset$, $f(c) < g(c) + \tilde{\theta}_{d-c}(g(d); \Lambda)\cdot\omega$, and $f <^d_\Lambda g(d)$, cf. Definition 3.23(6). Then $o_\Lambda(f) < o_\Lambda(g)$ holds.*

Lemma 6.3 *For irreducible finite functions $f, g : \Lambda \to \varphi_\Lambda(0)$ with base Λ, assume $f <^0_{lx} g$. Then $o_\Lambda(f) < o_\Lambda(g)$ holds.*

6.1 Props

In this subsection an ordinal $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\alpha)$ and a pair $\mathtt{g}(\alpha) = (\mathtt{g}_1(\alpha), \mathtt{g}_2(\alpha))$ are introduced for ordinal terms α. These are needed to show that there is no infinite sequence $\{\rho_n, \kappa_n\}_n$ such that $\rho_0 \prec \mathbb{S}$, $\kappa_n \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho_n]\} \cup \{\rho_n^{\dagger k} : k > 0\}$ and either $\rho_{n+1} \prec \rho_n^{\dagger k} = \kappa_n$ or $\rho_{n+1} \prec \tau^{\dagger m}$ for $\tau \prec \mathbb{I}[\rho_n] = \kappa_n$, cf. Proposition 6.9, Lemmas 6.13 and 7.34.

Definition 6.4 Let $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{T}^\dagger \in SSt$. For $a \in \mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon(\mathbb{I})}(\mathbb{S})$, the *prop* $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(a)$ of a denotes an ordinal term defined recursively as follows.

1. $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathbb{I}) = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(a) = 0$ if $a \leq \mathbb{T}$
   In what follows assume $\mathbb{I} \neq a > \mathbb{T}$.
2. $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(a) = \max_{i \leq m} \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(a_i)$ if $a = a_0 + \cdots + a_m$.
   $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(a) = \max\{\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(b), \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(c)\}$ if $a = \varphi bc$.
3. $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(a) = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\kappa)$ if $a \in \{\mathbb{I}[\kappa]\} \cup \{\kappa^{\dagger n} : n > 0\}$ for a $\kappa \in L(\mathbb{S})$.
4. $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathbb{U}^\dagger) = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\mathbb{U})$ for $\mathbb{T} \leq \mathbb{U} \in St$.
5. For $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)) = \max\{\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(b) : b \in SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)\}$, let

$$\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\psi_\kappa^f(a)) = \begin{cases} \max\{\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\kappa), \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(a), \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f))\} & \text{if } \kappa > \mathbb{S} \\ \max\{a, \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(a)\} & \text{if } \kappa = \mathbb{S} \\ \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\kappa) & \text{if } \kappa < \mathbb{S} \end{cases}$$

Proposition 6.5 *Let $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$ and $\alpha = \psi_{\mathbb{S}}^f(a)$, $\beta = \psi_{\mathbb{S}}^g(b)$ with $\{\alpha, \beta\} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon(\mathbb{I})}(\mathbb{S})$.*

1. *Let $c \in \mathcal{H}_b(\beta)$ with $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(c) \neq 0$. Then there exists a subterm $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_b(\beta)$ of c such that $\gamma \prec \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\gamma) = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(c)$.*
2. *$\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)) \leq \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\alpha) = \max\{a, \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(a)\}$ holds.*
3. *$\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\beta) \leq \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\alpha)$ if $\beta < \alpha$.*
4. *Let $\delta < \alpha < \beta$ with $\delta \prec \beta$. Then $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\beta) \leq \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\alpha)$.*
5. *Let $\{\gamma, \delta\} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon(\mathbb{I})}(\mathbb{S})$. Then $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\gamma) \leq \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\delta)$ if $\gamma < \delta$.*

Proof. 6.5.1. By induction on ℓc.
6.5.2. By (10) in Definition 3.23.5 we obtain $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(SC_{\mathbb{I}}(a))$.
By induction on ℓb, we see $b \in \mathcal{H}_a(SC_{\mathbb{I}}(a)) \Rightarrow \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(b) \leq \max\{a, \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(a)\}$.
We show Propositions 6.5.3 and 6.5.4 simultaneously by induction on $\ell\beta + \ell\alpha$.
6.5.3. If $a = b$, then $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\beta) = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\alpha)$. Let $b < a$. We can assume $a < c = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(b)$. By Proposition 6.5.1 pick a shortest subterm $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_b(\beta) \cap \mathbb{S} \subset \beta$ of b such that $\gamma \prec \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\gamma) = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(b) = c$ for $b \in \mathcal{H}_b(\beta)$. Then $\gamma \preceq \delta = \psi_{\mathbb{S}}^h(c)$ for some h

and $\gamma < \beta$. If $\delta \leq \alpha$, then IH yields $c = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\delta) \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\alpha)$. Assume $\gamma < \alpha < \delta$ with $\gamma \prec \delta$. IH for Proposition 6.5.4 then yields $c \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\alpha)$.

Next let $a < b$. Pick a subterm η of a term in $\{a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)$ such that $\beta \leq \eta \in \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha)$ and $\eta \prec \mathbb{S}$. Let $\eta \preceq \psi^h_{\mathbb{S}}(d) = \sigma$ for some h and d. Then we obtain $\beta \leq \sigma$, and IH yields $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\beta) \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\sigma) = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\eta)$. On the other hand we have $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\eta) \leq \max\{a, \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(a)\}$ by Proposition 6.5.2. Hence $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\beta) \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\alpha)$.
6.5.4. Pick a subterm η of a term in $\{a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)$ such that $\delta \leq \eta \in \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha)$, $\eta \prec \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\eta) \leq \max\{a, \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(a)\}$ by Proposition 6.5.2. Let $\eta \preceq \psi^h_{\mathbb{S}}(d) = \sigma$ for some h and d. Then we obtain $\delta < \sigma$. If $\beta \leq \sigma$, then IH for Proposition 6.5.3 yields $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\beta) \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\sigma) = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\eta) \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\alpha)$. Otherwise we obtain $\delta < \sigma < \beta$ with $\delta \prec \beta$. IH yields $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\beta) \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\sigma) \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\alpha)$.
6.5.5. This is seen by induction on $\ell\gamma + \ell\delta$ using Propositions 6.5.3 and 6.5.4. □

The set Cr of strongly critical numbers in $OT(\mathbb{I})$ is divided to $Cr = LS \cup SSt \cup \bigcup\{L(\mathbb{S}) : \mathbb{S} \in SSt\} \cup (Cr \cap (\Omega + 1))$, cf. Definition 3.25.

Definition 6.6 Let $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$ and $\alpha \in L(\mathbb{S})$.

1. Let us associate ordinals $\mathfrak{g}_0(\alpha), \mathfrak{g}^*_0(\alpha)$ and $\mathfrak{g}_2(\alpha)$ as follows.
   (a) $\mathfrak{g}_0(\alpha) = \mathfrak{g}_2(\alpha) = 0$ for $\alpha \notin \Psi$.
   (b) If $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$, then let $\mathfrak{g}_0(\rho) = \mathfrak{g}^*_0(\rho) = \mathfrak{g}_0(\psi_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]}(b)) = \mathfrak{g}^*_0(\psi_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]}(b)) = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho)$ for every b. Also $\mathfrak{g}_2(\rho) = o_{\mathbb{I}}(m(\rho)) + 1$ for $m(\rho) : \mathbb{I} \to \varphi_{\mathbb{I}}(0)$ with base $\mathbb{I}$, and $\mathfrak{g}_2(\psi_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]}(b)) = 0$.
   (c) Let $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$ and $\alpha \preceq^R \tau \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho]\} \cup \{\rho^{\dagger k} : k > 0\}$, where $\alpha \neq \psi_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]}(b)$ for any b if $\tau = \mathbb{I}[\rho]$. Let $\mathfrak{g}^*_0(\alpha) = \mathfrak{g}_0(\rho)$. Let $\beta \in M_\rho$ be such that $\alpha = \beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$. If $\alpha \in \Psi$, let $\mathfrak{g}_i(\alpha) = \mathfrak{g}_i(\beta)$ for $i = 0, 2$.
2. Let us define ordinals $\mathfrak{g}'_1(\alpha)$ and $\mathfrak{g}_1(\alpha)$ as follows. Let $\lambda = \omega + \omega$.
   (a) Let $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$. Then $\mathfrak{g}'_1(\rho) = \lambda^{\mathfrak{g}_0(\rho)}$ and $\mathfrak{g}_1(\rho) = \lambda^{\mathfrak{g}_0(\rho)+1}$.
   (b) Let $\rho \in L(\mathbb{S})$ be such that $\alpha \preceq \kappa \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho]\} \cup \{(\psi_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]}(a))^{\dagger k}, \rho^{\dagger k} : k > 0\}$. Let $\mathfrak{g}_1(\alpha) = \mathfrak{g}'_1(\alpha) + \lambda^{\mathfrak{g}_0(\rho)}$.
      i. $\mathfrak{g}'_1(\rho^{\dagger k}) = \mathfrak{g}'_1(\rho) + \lambda^{\mathfrak{g}_0(\rho)} \cdot k$ for $k > 0$.
      ii. $\alpha \prec \rho^{\dagger k}$: $\mathfrak{g}'_1(\alpha) = \mathfrak{g}'_1(\rho) + \lambda^{\mathfrak{g}_0(\rho)} \cdot (k-1)$ for $k > 0$.
      iii. $\mathfrak{g}'_1(\mathbb{I}[\rho]) = \mathfrak{g}'_1(\rho) + \lambda^{\mathfrak{g}_0(\rho)} \cdot (\omega + 1)$.
      iv. $\alpha \prec \mathbb{I}[\rho]$: $\mathfrak{g}'_1(\alpha) = \mathfrak{g}'_1(\rho) + \lambda^{\mathfrak{g}_0(\rho)} \cdot \omega$.
      v. $\mathfrak{g}'_1((\psi_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]}(a))^{\dagger k}) = \mathfrak{g}'_1(\rho) + \lambda^{\mathfrak{g}_0(\rho)} \cdot (\omega + k)$ for $k > 0$.
      vi. $\alpha \prec (\psi_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]}(a))^{\dagger k}$: $\mathfrak{g}'_1(\alpha) = \mathfrak{g}'_1(\rho) + \lambda^{\mathfrak{g}_0(\rho)} \cdot (\omega + k - 1)$ for $k > 0$.

Let $\mathfrak{g}(\alpha) = (\mathfrak{g}_1(\alpha), \mathfrak{g}_2(\alpha))$.

Proposition 6.7 *Let $b = \mathfrak{p}_0(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in L(\mathbb{S}) \cap \Psi$ with $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$. Then $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathfrak{g}_2(\alpha)) \subset \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)$ and $b \in \mathcal{H}_b(\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b))$. Moreover $\mathfrak{p}_0(\alpha) \leq \mathfrak{g}^*_0(\alpha)$.*

Proof. By induction on $\ell\alpha$. We obtain $b \in \mathcal{H}_b(\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b))$ by $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(b) \subset \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)$.
Case 1. $\alpha \preceq \psi^g_{\mathbb{S}}(b)$ with an $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$, and $f = m(\alpha)$: We obtain $c < b$ by (9) if $\mathbb{S} = (\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(c))^{\dagger m}$, and $\alpha < \mathbb{S} < \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)$. We obtain $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathtt{g}_2(\alpha)) \subset SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)$ for $\mathtt{g}_2(\alpha) = o_{\mathbb{I}}(f) + 1$. By (10) and (11) we obtain $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_b(\alpha) \cap \mathbb{I}$. Hence $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathtt{g}_2(\alpha)) \subset \mathcal{H}_b(\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)) \cap \mathbb{I} \subset \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)$.

On the other hand we have $\mathtt{p}_0(\alpha) = b \leq \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\alpha) = \mathtt{g}^*_0(\alpha)$.
Case 2. $\rho \prec \mathbb{S} \in SSt$, $\alpha \prec^R \tau \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho]\} \cup \{\rho^{\dagger k} : k > 0\}$ and $\alpha = \beta[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ for a $\beta \in M_\rho$: Then $b = \mathtt{p}_0(\alpha) = \mathtt{p}_0(\beta)$, and IH yields $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathtt{g}_2(\alpha)) = SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathtt{g}_2(\beta)) \subset \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)$ for $\mathtt{g}_2(\alpha) = \mathtt{g}_2(\beta)$, and $\mathtt{p}_0(\beta) \leq \mathtt{g}^*_0(\beta)$. On the other hand we have $\mathtt{g}^*_0(\alpha) = \mathtt{g}_0(\rho) = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho) \geq \mathtt{p}_0(\rho) = c$ with $M_\rho = \mathcal{H}_c(\rho)$. Thus it suffices to show $\mathtt{g}^*_0(\beta) \leq \mathtt{p}_0(\rho)$ for $\beta \in \mathcal{H}_c(\rho)$ by induction on $\ell\beta$. If $\beta \preceq \psi^f_{\mathbb{T}}(d)$ with a $\mathbb{T} \in SSt$, then $\mathtt{g}^*_0(\beta) = \mathtt{g}_0(\beta) = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{T}}(\beta) = \max\{d, \mathtt{p}_T(d)\}$. We obtain $d < c$ and $d \in \mathcal{H}_c(\rho)$. IH yields $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{T}}(d) < c$.

Next let $\beta = \gamma[\tau/\mathbb{T}]$ with a $\gamma \in M_\tau$. Then $\mathtt{g}^*_0(\beta) = \mathtt{g}^*_0(\tau)$ and $\tau \in M_\rho$. IH yields $\mathtt{g}^*_0(\tau) \leq \mathtt{p}_0(\rho)$. □

Proposition 6.8 *Let $\tau^\dagger \in L(\mathbb{S}) \cup \{\mathbb{S}\}$ and $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$.*
For $\rho, \eta \prec \tau^\dagger$, if $\rho < \eta$, then $\mathtt{g}_0(\rho) \leq \mathtt{g}_0(\eta)$.

Proof. By induction on $\ell\rho$.
Case 1. $\tau^\dagger = \mathbb{S}$: Let $\eta \preceq \alpha = \psi^f_{\mathbb{S}}(a)$ and $\rho \preceq \beta = \psi^g_{\mathbb{S}}(b)$. Then $\mathtt{g}_0(\eta) = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\eta) = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\alpha)$ and $\mathtt{g}_0(\rho) = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho) = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\beta)$. If $\beta \leq \alpha$, then Proposition 6.5.3 yields $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\beta) \leq \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\alpha)$. Suppose $\rho < \alpha < \beta$ with $\rho \prec \beta$. We obtain $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\beta) \leq \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\alpha)$ by Proposition 6.5.4.
Case 2. $\tau^\dagger \neq \mathbb{S}$: Let $\kappa \prec \mathbb{S}$ be such that either $\tau^\dagger \preceq^R \kappa^{\dagger n}$ or $\tau^\dagger \prec^R \mathbb{I}[\kappa]$. Then $\mathtt{g}_0(\rho) = \mathtt{g}_0(\rho_1)$ and $\mathtt{g}_0(\eta) = \mathtt{g}_0(\eta_1)$ for $\rho_1 = \rho[\kappa/\mathbb{S}]^{-1}$ and $\eta_1 = \eta[\kappa/\mathbb{S}]^{-1}$, cf. Definition 3.34 for uncollapsing. We obtain $\rho_1 < \eta_1$, $\rho_1 \prec \tau^\dagger_1$ and $\eta_1 \prec \tau^\dagger_1$ for $\tau_1 = \tau[\kappa/\mathbb{S}]^{-1}$. IH with $\ell\rho_1 < \ell\rho$ yields $\mathtt{g}_0(\rho_1) \leq \mathtt{g}_0(\eta_1)$. □

Proposition 6.9 *Let $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$, $\rho \prec \tau^\dagger \in L(\mathbb{S}) \cup \{\mathbb{S}\}$, and $\alpha \prec \sigma^{\dagger m}$, where $\sigma^{\dagger m} \preceq^R \kappa \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho]\} \cup \{\rho^{\dagger k} : k > 0\}$. Then $\mathtt{g}_0(\alpha) < \mathtt{g}_0(\rho)$.*

Proof. We may assume that either $\sigma = \rho$ or $\sigma = \psi_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]}(\gamma)$ for a γ. By induction on $\ell\alpha$ we show $\mathtt{g}_0(\alpha) < \mathtt{g}_0(\rho)$.
Case 1. $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$: Let $\rho \preceq \beta = \psi^g_{\mathbb{S}}(b)$. Then $\mathtt{g}_0(\rho) = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\psi^g_{\mathbb{S}}(b))$. From $b \in \mathcal{H}_b(\psi^g_{\mathbb{S}}(b))$ we see $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{T}^{\dagger m}}(b) < \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{T}^{\dagger m}}(\psi_{\mathbb{T}^{\dagger m}}(b)) = b \leq \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\psi^g_{\mathbb{S}}(b)) = \mathtt{g}_0(\rho)$ for any $\mathbb{T}^{\dagger m} > \mathbb{S}$.
Case 1.1. $\sigma = \rho$: Let $\alpha \preceq \psi^{h_1}_{\rho^{\dagger m}}(c_1) = \left(\psi^h_{\mathbb{S}^{\dagger m}}(c)\right)[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$, where $h_1 = h[\rho/\mathbb{S}] \neq \emptyset$, $c_1 = c[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ and $\rho^{\dagger m} = \mathbb{S}^{\dagger m}[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$. Then $\mathtt{g}_0(\alpha) = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}^{\dagger m}}(\psi^h_{\mathbb{S}^{\dagger m}}(c))$. We have $\rho < \psi^h_{\mathbb{S}^{\dagger m}}(c) \in M_\rho \subset \mathcal{H}_b(\rho)$, and hence $c < b$. We obtain $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}^{\dagger m}}(c) \leq \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}^{\dagger m}}(b)$ by Proposition 6.5.5.
Case 1.2. $\sigma = \psi_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]}(\gamma_1)$ for a γ_1: Let $\alpha \preceq \psi^{h_1}_{\sigma^{\dagger m}}(c_1) = \left(\psi^h_{\mathbb{T}^{\dagger m}}(c)\right)[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$, where $h_1 = h[\rho/\mathbb{S}] \neq \emptyset$, $c_1 = c[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ and $\sigma = \mathbb{T}[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ with $\mathbb{T} = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(\gamma)$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$. Then $\mathtt{g}_0(\alpha) = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{T}^{\dagger m}}(\psi^h_{\mathbb{T}^{\dagger m}}(c))$. We have $\psi^h_{\mathbb{T}^{\dagger m}}(c) \in M_\rho$. As in **Case 1.1** we see $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}^{\dagger m}}(\psi^h_{\mathbb{T}^{\dagger m}}(c)) \leq \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}^{\dagger m}}(\psi_{\mathbb{T}^{\dagger m}}(b))$ from $\mathbb{S} < \mathbb{T}^{\dagger m}$, i.e., from $\mathbb{S} < \mathbb{T} = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(\gamma) \in LS$.
Case 2. $\rho \prec \tau^\dagger \neq \mathbb{S}$: Let $\lambda \prec \mathbb{S}$ be such that either $\alpha \prec^R \lambda^{\dagger k}$ or $\alpha \prec^R \mathbb{I}[\lambda]$.

Then $\mathrm{g}_0(\alpha) = \mathrm{g}_0(\alpha_1)$ with $\alpha = \alpha_1[\lambda/\mathbb{S}]$ and $\mathrm{g}_0(\rho) = \mathrm{g}_0(\rho_1)$ with $\rho = \rho_1[\lambda/\mathbb{S}]$. We have $\rho_1 \prec (\tau[\lambda/\mathbb{S}]^{-1})^\dagger$ and $\alpha_1 \prec (\sigma[\lambda/\mathbb{S}]^{-1})^{\dagger m}$ with $\sigma = \rho$ or $\sigma = \psi_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]}(\gamma)$ for a γ. If $(\tau[\lambda/\mathbb{S}]^{-1})^\dagger \in SSt$, then we obtain $\mathrm{g}_0(\alpha_1) < \mathrm{g}_0(\rho_1)$ by **Case 1**. Otherwise IH with $\ell\alpha_1 < \ell\alpha$ yields the assertion. □

Proposition 6.10 *Let $\{\alpha, \beta\} \subset L(\mathbb{S})$ with an $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$. If $\alpha < \beta$, then $\mathrm{g}^*_0(\alpha) \leq \mathrm{g}^*_0(\beta)$.*

Proof. Let $\rho, \eta \prec \mathbb{S}$ be such that either $\alpha = \rho$ or $\alpha \preceq^R \kappa \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho]\} \cup \{\rho^{\dagger k} : k > 0\}$, and either $\beta = \eta$ or $\beta \preceq^R \sigma \in \{\mathbb{I}[\eta]\} \cup \{\eta^{\dagger m} : m > 0\}$. Then $\rho \leq \eta$ by $\alpha < \beta$. Proposition 6.8 yields $\mathrm{g}^*_0(\alpha) = \mathrm{g}_0(\rho) \leq \mathrm{g}_0(\eta) = \mathrm{g}^*_0(\beta)$. □

Definition 6.11 A finite set $R(\eta) \subset \Psi$ is defined.

1. Let $\eta \prec \mathbb{I}$. $\gamma \in R(\eta)$ holds iff there exists an $SSt \ni \mathbb{S} < \eta$ such that $\gamma \in L(\mathbb{S}) \cap \Psi$.
2. Let $\eta \in L(\mathbb{S})$ with an $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$. $\gamma \in R(\eta)$ holds iff $\gamma \in \Psi$ and one of the following holds:
   (a) $\gamma \prec \eta$.
   (b) There exist $\tau \in L(\mathbb{S})$ and $m > 0$ such that $\eta \preceq \mathbb{I}[\tau]$, and $\gamma \prec^R \mathbb{I}[\tau]$ or $\gamma \prec^R \tau^{\dagger m}$.
   (c) There exist $\tau \in L(\mathbb{S})$ and $n, m > 0$ such that $\eta \preceq \tau^{\dagger n}$, $\gamma \prec^R \tau^{\dagger m}$ and $m \leq n$.
   (d) There exist $\tau \in L(\mathbb{S})$, ρ and $m > 0$ such that $\eta \prec \mathbb{I}[\tau]$, $\rho \prec \mathbb{I}[\tau]$, $\rho < \eta$ and $\gamma \prec^R \rho^{\dagger m}$.
   (e) There exist $\tau \in (L(\mathbb{S}) \cup \{\mathbb{S}\}) \cap SSt^M$, ρ and κ such that $\eta, \rho \prec \tau$, $\rho < \eta$, $\gamma \prec^R \kappa \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho]\} \cup \{\rho^{\dagger m} : m > 0\}$.

Note that $R(\eta) \subset L(\mathbb{S})$ if $\eta \in L(\mathbb{S})$, and $\gamma^{-1} = \eta^{-1} = \mathbb{T}$ for every $\gamma, \eta \in L(\mathbb{S})$ with $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{T}^\dagger$.

Proposition 6.12 *Let $\eta \in \bigcup_{\mathbb{S}} LS(\mathbb{S})$, and $\eta > \gamma = \psi^f_\pi(a) \in \Psi$ with $\pi \leq \eta$. Assume $\gamma \notin R(\eta)$, and let τ be maximal such that $\gamma \prec \tau \leq \eta$. Then $\eta > \tau \in \Psi$.*

Lemma 6.13 *Let $\eta \in L(\mathbb{S})$ with $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$. Then $\mathrm{g}^*_0(\gamma) \leq \mathrm{g}^*_0(\eta)$, $\mathrm{g}(\gamma) <_{lx} \mathrm{g}(\eta)$ and $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathrm{g}_2(\gamma)) \subset \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)$ for $\gamma \in R(\eta)$ and $b = \mathrm{g}^*_0(\eta)$.*

Proof.
Case 1. $\gamma \prec \eta$: We have $\mathrm{g}^*_0(\gamma) = \mathrm{g}^*_0(\eta)$. If $\eta \in \Psi$, then $\mathrm{g}_1(\eta) = \mathrm{g}_1(\gamma)$ and $\mathrm{g}_2(\gamma) < \mathrm{g}_2(\eta)$ by Lemma 6.2. Otherwise $\mathrm{g}_1(\gamma) < \mathrm{g}_1(\eta)$. In what follows assume $\gamma \not\prec \eta$. We claim that $\mathrm{g}_1(\gamma) < \mathrm{g}_1(\eta)$.
Case 2. $\eta \preceq \tau_1$, $\gamma \prec^R \tau_2$ with $\{\tau_2 \leq \tau_1\} \subset \{\mathbb{I}[\tau]\} \cup \{\tau^{\dagger m} : m > 0\}$ for a $\tau \in L(\mathbb{S})$, cf. Definitions 6.11.2b and 6.11.2c: We have $\mathrm{g}^*_0(\tau) = \mathrm{g}^*_0(\eta) = \mathrm{g}^*_0(\gamma)$ and $\mathrm{g}_1(\eta) = \mathrm{g}'_1(\tau) + \lambda^{\mathrm{g}_0(\tau)} \cdot (\alpha + 1)$ for an $\alpha < \lambda = \omega + \omega$. If $\gamma \prec \tau_2$, then $\mathrm{g}_1(\gamma) = \mathrm{g}'_1(\tau) + \lambda^{\mathrm{g}_0(\tau)} \cdot (\beta + 1)$ with $\beta < \alpha$. Otherwise let $\sigma \prec \tau_2$ be such that

$\gamma \prec \sigma_1 \in SSt^M$, $\sigma_1 \preceq^R \kappa_1 \in \{\mathbb{I}[\sigma]\} \cup \{\sigma^{\dagger m} : m > 0\}$. We obtain $\mathtt{g}_0(\sigma) < \mathtt{g}_0(\tau)$ by Proposition 6.9, and $\mathtt{g}_1(\gamma) = \mathtt{g}'_1(\tau) + \lambda^{\mathtt{g}_0(\tau)} \cdot \beta + \delta$ with $\delta < \lambda^{\mathtt{g}_0(\sigma)+1} \leq \lambda^{\mathtt{g}_0(\tau)}$.
Case 3. $\rho, \eta \prec \tau_1 \in \{\mathbb{I}[\tau]\} \cup \{\tau^{\dagger n} : n > 0\}$, $\rho < \eta$ and $\gamma \prec^R \kappa \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho]\} \cup \{\rho^{\dagger m} : m > 0\}$, cf. Definitions 6.11.2d and 6.11.2e: We have $\mathtt{g}^*_0(\tau) = \mathtt{g}^*_0(\eta) = \mathtt{g}^*_0(\gamma)$, $\mathtt{g}'_1(\rho) = \mathtt{g}'_1(\tau) + \lambda^{\mathtt{g}_0(\tau)} \cdot \alpha$ for an $\alpha < \lambda$, $\mathtt{g}_1(\eta) = \mathtt{g}'_1(\rho) + \lambda^{\mathtt{g}_0(\tau)}$, and $\mathtt{g}_1(\gamma) = \mathtt{g}'_1(\rho) + \delta$ for $\delta < \lambda^{\mathtt{g}_0(\tau)}$ by Proposition 6.9.
Case 4. $\rho, \eta \prec \mathbb{S}$, $\rho < \eta$ and $\gamma \prec^R \kappa \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho]\} \cup \{\rho^{\dagger m} : m > 0\}$, cf. Definition 6.11.2e: We have $\mathtt{g}^*_0(\eta) = \mathtt{g}_0(\eta) \geq \mathtt{g}_0(\rho) = \mathtt{g}^*_0(\rho) = \mathtt{g}^*_0(\gamma)$, $\mathtt{g}_1(\eta) = \lambda^{\mathtt{g}_0(\eta)+1}$, and $\mathtt{g}'_1(\rho) = \lambda^{\mathtt{g}_0(\rho)}$, where $\mathtt{g}_0(\rho) \leq \mathtt{g}_0(\eta)$ by Proposition 6.8. On the other hand we have $\mathtt{g}_1(\gamma) = \mathtt{g}'_1(\rho) + \delta$ with $\delta < \lambda^{\mathtt{g}_0(\rho)+1}$.

Thus $\mathtt{g}(\gamma) <_{lx} \mathtt{g}(\eta)$ is shown. In each case $c = \mathtt{p}_0(\gamma) \leq \mathtt{g}^*_0(\gamma) \leq \mathtt{g}^*_0(\eta) = b$ holds by Proposition 6.7. We obtain $\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(c) \leq \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)$ by $c \in \mathcal{H}_c(\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(c))$ and $b \in \mathcal{H}_b(\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b))$. On the other hand we have $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathtt{g}_2(\gamma)) \subset \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(c)$ by Proposition 6.7. Hence $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathtt{g}_2(\gamma)) \subset \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)$. □

Proposition 6.14 *Let $\{\alpha_1, \beta\} \subset L(\mathbb{S})$ for an $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$, $\alpha_1 = \psi^f_\kappa(a) \leq \psi^h_\sigma(c) = \beta$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha_1)$. Then $c < a$ and $\mathtt{g}^*_0(\beta) \leq \mathtt{g}^*_0(\alpha_1)$.*

Proof. By induction on $\ell\beta$. We have $c \in K_{\alpha_1}(\beta) < a$, and $\{\sigma, c\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha_1)$. We show $\mathtt{g}^*_0(\beta) \leq \mathtt{h}(\alpha_1)$. First let $\beta \prec \mathbb{S}$. We show $\mathtt{g}^*_0(\beta) = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\beta) \leq \mathtt{g}^*_0(\alpha_1)$. We can assume $\sigma = \mathbb{S}$ by IH. Let $\gamma = \psi^g_{\mathbb{S}}(b)$ be a proper subterm of β. If $\gamma \in K_{\alpha_1}(\beta)$, then $b < a$. If $\gamma < \alpha_1$, then $\mathtt{g}^*_0(\gamma) \leq \mathtt{g}^*_0(\alpha_1)$ by Proposition 6.10.

Second let $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$ and $\beta \prec^R \kappa \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho]\} \cup \{\rho^{\dagger k} : k > 0\}$. Then $\mathtt{g}^*_0(\beta) = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho)$. If $\alpha_1 \leq \rho$, then $\rho \in \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha_1)$ and $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho) \leq \mathtt{g}^*_0(\alpha_1)$ by the first case. Let $\rho < \alpha_1 < \beta$. Then we obtain $\mathtt{g}^*_0(\alpha) = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho) = \mathtt{g}^*_0(\beta)$. □

6.2 Coefficients

In this subsection we introduce coefficient sets $\mathcal{E}(\alpha), G_\delta(\alpha), F_X(\alpha), k_X(\alpha)$ of $\alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ for $X \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$, each of which is a finite set of subterms of α. These are utilized in our well-foundedness proof. Roughly $\mathcal{E}(\alpha)$ is the set of subterms of the form $\psi^f_\pi(a)$, and $F_X(\alpha)$ $[k_X(\alpha)]$ the set of subterms in X [subterms not in X], resp.

Definition 6.15 For terms $\alpha, \kappa, \delta \in OT(\mathbb{I})$, finite sets $\mathcal{E}(\alpha), G_\kappa(\alpha), F_\delta(\alpha), k_\delta(\alpha) \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$ are defined recursively as follows.

1. $\mathcal{E}(\alpha) = \emptyset$ for $\alpha \in \{0, \Omega_1, \mathbb{I}\}$. $\mathcal{E}(\alpha_m + \cdots + \alpha_0) = \bigcup_{i \leq m} \mathcal{E}(\alpha_i)$. $\mathcal{E}(\varphi\beta\gamma) = \mathcal{E}(\beta) \cup \mathcal{E}(\gamma)$. $\mathcal{E}(\mathbb{I}[\rho]) = \mathcal{E}(\rho^{+^1}) = \mathcal{E}(\rho)$. $\mathcal{E}(\psi^f_\pi(a)) = \{\psi^f_\pi(a)\}$.
2. $\mathcal{A}(\alpha) = \bigcup\{\mathcal{A}(\beta) : \beta \in \mathcal{E}(\alpha)\}$ for $\mathcal{A} \in \{G_\kappa, F_\delta, k_\delta\}$.
3. $$G_\delta(\psi^f_\pi(a)) = \begin{cases} G_\delta(\{\pi, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)) & \delta < \pi \\ \{\psi^f_\pi(a)\} & \pi \leq \delta \end{cases}$$
$$F_X(\psi^f_\pi(a)) = \begin{cases} F_X(\{\pi, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)) & \psi^f_\pi(a) \notin X \\ \{\psi^f_\pi(a)\} & \psi^f_\pi(a) \in X \end{cases}$$

$$k_X(\psi^f_\pi(a)) = \begin{cases} \{\psi^f_\pi(a)\} \cup k_X(\{\pi, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)) & \psi^f_\pi(a) \notin X \\ \emptyset & \psi^f_\pi(a) \in X \end{cases}$$

4. For $\alpha \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho], \rho^\dagger\}$

$$G_\delta(\alpha) = \begin{cases} \{\alpha\} & \alpha < \delta \\ G_\delta(\rho) & \delta \leq \alpha \end{cases}$$

For $\mathcal{A} \in \{K_\delta, G_\delta, F_\delta, k_\delta\}$ and sets $X \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$, $\mathcal{A}(X) := \bigcup\{\mathcal{A}(\alpha) : \alpha \in X\}$.

Definition 6.16 $S(\eta)$ denotes the set of immediate subterms of η when $\eta \notin \mathcal{E}(\eta)$. For example $S(\varphi\beta\gamma) = \{\beta, \gamma\}$. $S(\eta) := \emptyset$ when $\eta \in \{0, \Omega, \mathbb{I}\}$, $S(\mathbb{I}[\rho]) = S(\rho^{\dagger k}) = \{\rho\}$, $S(\eta) = \{\eta\}$ when $\eta \in \mathcal{E}(\eta)$.

Proposition 6.17 *For $\{\alpha, \delta, a, b, \rho\} \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$,*

1. *$G_\delta(\alpha) \leq \alpha$.*
2. *$\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_a(b) \,\&\, b \prec \rho \Rightarrow G_\delta(\alpha) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(b)$.*

Proof. These are shown simultaneously by induction on $\ell\alpha$. It is easy to see that

$$G_\delta(\alpha) \ni \beta \Rightarrow \beta < \delta \,\&\, \ell\beta \leq \ell\alpha \tag{41}$$

6.17.1. Consider the case $\alpha = \psi^f_\pi(a)$ with $\delta < \pi$, $\pi \preceq \rho$ and $\rho \in SSt$. Then $G_\delta(\alpha) = G_\delta(\{\pi, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f))$. On the other hand we have $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \cup \{\pi, a\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha)$. Proposition 6.17.2 with (41) yields $G_\delta(SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \cup \{\pi, a\}) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha) \cap \pi \subset \alpha$. Hence $G_\delta(\alpha) < \alpha$.

Next let $\alpha = \mathbb{I}[\rho], \rho^\dagger$ with $\delta \leq \alpha$. Then $G_\delta(\alpha) = G_\delta(\rho)$. By IH we have $G_\delta(\rho) \leq \rho < \alpha$. Hence $G_\delta(\alpha) < \alpha$.

6.17.2. Since $G_\delta(\alpha) \leq \alpha$ by Proposition 6.17.1, we can assume $\alpha \geq b$.

Consider the case $\alpha = \psi^f_\pi(a)$ with $\delta < \pi$. Then $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \cup \{\pi, a\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(b)$ and $G_\delta(\alpha) = G_\delta(SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \cup \{\pi, a\})$. IH yields the lemma.

Next let $\alpha = \mathbb{I}[\tau], \tau^\dagger$ with $\delta \leq \alpha$. Then $G_\delta(\alpha) = G_\delta(\tau)$ and $\tau < \alpha$. $b \cup \rho \not\ni \alpha \in \mathcal{H}_a(b)$ yields $\tau \in \mathcal{H}_a(b)$. IH yields the lemma. □

Proposition 6.18 *If $\beta \notin \mathcal{H}_a(Y)$ and $K_X(\beta) < a$, then there exists a $\gamma \in F_X(\beta)$ such that $\mathcal{H}_a(Y) \not\ni \gamma \in X$.*

Proof. By induction on $\ell\beta$. Assume $\beta \notin \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha)$ and $K_X(\beta) < a$. By IH we can assume that $\beta = \psi^f_\kappa(b)$. If $\beta \in X$, then $\beta \in F_X(\beta)$, and $\gamma = \beta$ is a desired one. Assume $\beta \notin X$. Then we obtain $K_X(\beta) = \{b\} \cup K_X(\{b, \kappa\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)) < a$. In particular $b < a$, and hence $\{b, \kappa\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \not\subset \mathcal{H}_a(Y)$. By IH there exists a $\gamma \in F_X(\{b, \kappa\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)) = F_X(\beta)$ such that $\mathcal{H}_a(Y) \not\ni \gamma \in X$. □

7 Well-foundedness proof with the maximal distinguished sets

In this section working in the second order arithmetic Σ^1_3-DC + BI, we show the well-foundedness of the notation system $OT(\mathbb{I})$ up to *each* $\alpha < \Omega$. The proof is based on distinguished classes, which was first introduced by Buchholz [4].

An ordinal term σ in $OT(\mathbb{I})$ is said to be *regular* if $\psi^f_\sigma(a)$ is in $OT(\mathbb{I})$ for some f and a. Reg denotes the set of regular terms. In this section we need the next regular ordinal above an ordinal α in defining distinguished sets. Although it is customarily denoted by α^+, it is hard to discriminate α^+ from the next stable ordinal $\alpha^\dagger$. Therefore let us write for $\alpha < \mathbb{I}$, $\alpha^{+^1} = \min\{\sigma \in SSt : \sigma > \alpha\}$ for the next stable ordinal $\alpha^\dagger$, and $\alpha^{+^0} = \min\{\sigma \in Reg : \sigma > \alpha\}$ for the next regular ordinal α^+, when a confusion likely occurs. Let $\alpha^{+^1} := \alpha^{+^0} := \infty$ if $\alpha \geq \mathbb{I}$. Let $\alpha^{-^1} := \max\{\sigma \in St_\mathbb{I} \cup \{0\} : \sigma \leq \alpha\}$ when $\alpha < \mathbb{I}$, and $\alpha^{-^1} := \mathbb{I}$ if $\alpha \geq \mathbb{I}$. Since $SSt \subset Reg$, we obtain $\alpha^{+^0} \leq \alpha^{+^1}$ and $\beta^{+^0} < \sigma$ if $\beta < \sigma \in St$ since each $\sigma \in St$ is a limit of regular ordinals.

7.1 Distinguished sets

In this subsection we establish elementary facts on distinguished classes.

$X, Y, Z, \ldots$ range over *subsets* of $OT(\mathbb{I})$, while $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \ldots$ range over *classes*, which are definable by second-order formulas in the language of arithmetic. We define sets $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$ for $\alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ and $X \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$ as follows.

Definition 7.1 For $\alpha, \beta \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ and $X \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$, let us define a set $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$ recursively as follows.

1. $\{0, \Omega, \mathbb{I}\} \cup (X \cap \alpha) \subset \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$.
2. Let $(\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n) \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ with $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\} \subset \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$. Then $(\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n) \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$.
3. Let $\varphi\beta\gamma \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ with $\{\beta, \gamma\} \subset \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$. Then $\varphi\beta\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$.
4. Let $\psi^f_\sigma(\beta) \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ with $\{\sigma, \beta\} \cup SC_\mathbb{I}(f) \subset \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$. Then $\psi^f_\sigma(\beta) \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$ if $\sigma > \alpha$.
5. Let $\mathbb{I}[\rho] \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ with $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$. Then $\mathbb{I}[\rho] \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$ if $\mathbb{I}[\rho] \geq \alpha$.
6. Let $\rho^\dagger \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ with $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$. Then $\rho^\dagger \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$ if $\rho^\dagger \geq \alpha$.

Proposition 7.2 *Assume* $\forall\gamma \geq \alpha[\gamma \in P \Rightarrow \gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(P)]$ *for a set* $P \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$.

1. $\alpha \leq \beta \Rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\beta(P) \subset \mathcal{C}^\alpha(P)$.
2. $\alpha \leq \beta < \alpha^{+^0} \Rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\beta(P) = \mathcal{C}^\alpha(P)$.

Proof. 7.2.1. We see by induction on $\ell\gamma\,(\gamma \in OT(\mathbb{I}))$ that

$$\forall\beta \geq \alpha[\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(P) \Rightarrow \gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(P) \cup (P \cap \beta)] \tag{42}$$

For example, if $\psi^f_\pi(\delta) \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(P)$ with $\pi > \beta \geq \alpha$ and $\{\pi, \delta\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{C}^\alpha(P) \cup (P \cap \beta)$, then $\pi \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(P)$, and for any $\gamma \in \{\delta\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)$, either $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(P)$ or $\gamma \in P \cap \beta$. If $\gamma < \alpha$, then $\gamma \in P \cap \alpha \subset \mathcal{C}^\alpha(P)$. If $\alpha \leq \gamma \in P \cap \beta$, then $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(P)$ by the assumption, and by IH we have $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(P) \cup (P \cap \gamma)$, i.e., $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(P)$. Therefore $\{\pi, \delta\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{C}^\alpha(P)$, and $\psi^f_\pi(\delta) \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(P)$.

Using (42) we see from the assumption that $\forall\beta \geq \alpha[\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(P) \Rightarrow \gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(P)]$.

7.2.2. Assume $\alpha \leq \beta < \alpha^{+^0}$. Then by Proposition 7.2.1 we have $\mathcal{C}^\beta(P) \subset \mathcal{C}^\alpha(P)$. $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(P) \Rightarrow \gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(P)$ is seen by induction on $\ell\gamma$ using the facts $\beta^{-^0} = \alpha^{-^0}$ and $\beta^{+^0} = \alpha^{+^0}$. □

Definition 7.3 1. $Prg[X, Y] :\Leftrightarrow \forall\alpha \in X(X \cap \alpha \subset Y \to \alpha \in Y)$.

2. For a definable class $\mathcal{X}$, $TI[\mathcal{X}]$ denotes the schema:
   $TI[\mathcal{X}] :\Leftrightarrow Prg[\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}] \to \mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{Y}$ holds for any definable classes $\mathcal{Y}$.

3. For $X \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$, $W(X)$ denotes the *well-founded part* of X.

4. $Wo[X] :\Leftrightarrow X \subset W(X)$.

Note that for $\alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I})$, $W(X) \cap \alpha = W(X \cap \alpha)$.

Definition 7.4 For $P, X \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$ and $\gamma \in OT(\mathbb{I}) \cap \mathbb{I}$, let

$$\begin{aligned}
W^\alpha_0(P) &:= W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(P)) \\
D^\gamma_0[P; X] &:\Leftrightarrow P \cap \gamma^{-^1} = X \cap \gamma^{-^1} \,\&\, Wo[X \cap \gamma^{-^1}] \,\& \\
&\qquad \forall\alpha\left(\gamma^{-^1} \leq \alpha \leq P \to W^\alpha_0(P) \cap \alpha^{+^0} = P \cap \alpha^{+^0}\right) \qquad (43) \\
\mathcal{W}^\gamma_1(X) &:= \bigcup\{P \subset OT(\mathbb{I}) : D^\gamma_0[P; X]\} \\
D_1[X] &:\Leftrightarrow Wo[X] \,\&\, \forall\gamma\left(\gamma \leq X \to \mathcal{W}^\gamma_1(X) \cap \gamma^{+^1} = X \cap \gamma^{+^1}\right) \qquad (44) \\
\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}_2 &:= \bigcup\{X \subset OT(\mathbb{I}) : D_1[X]\}
\end{aligned}$$

A set P is said to be a 0-*distinguished set* for γ and X if $D^\gamma_0[P; X]$, and a set X is a 1-*distinguished set* if $D_1[X]$.

Observe that in Σ^1_2-AC, $W^\alpha_0(P)$ is Π^1_1, $D^\gamma_0[P; X]$ is Δ^1_2, $\mathcal{W}^\gamma_1(X)$ is Σ^1_2, and $D_1[X]$ is Δ^1_3. Hence $\mathcal{W}$ is a Σ^1_3-class.

Let $\alpha \in P$ for a 0-distinguished set P for $\gamma < \mathbb{I}$ and X. If $\alpha < \gamma^{-^1}$, then $\alpha \in X$ with $Wo[X]$. Otherwise $W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(P)) \cap \alpha^{+^0} = W^\alpha_0(P) \cap \alpha^{+^0} = P \cap \alpha^{+^0}$ with $\alpha < \alpha^{+^0}$. Hence P is a well order.

Proposition 7.5 *Let* $D^\gamma_0[P; X]$ *and* $\gamma^{-^1} \leq \alpha \in P$. *Then* $\forall\beta \geq \gamma^{-^1}[\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(P)]$.

Proof. Let $D_0^\gamma[P;X]$ and $\gamma^{-^1} \leq \alpha \in P$. We obtain $\alpha \in P \cap \alpha^{+^0} = W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(P)) \cap \alpha^{+^0} \subset \mathcal{C}^\alpha(P)$. Hence $\forall \delta \geq \gamma^{-^1}(\delta \in P \Rightarrow \delta \in \mathcal{C}^\delta(P))$, and $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(P)$ for any $\gamma^{-^1} \leq \beta \leq \alpha$ by Proposition 7.2.1. Moreover for $\beta > \alpha$ we have $\alpha \in P \cap \beta \subset \mathcal{C}^\beta(P)$. □

Proposition 7.6 *Let* $D_0^\gamma[P;X]$, $D_0^\gamma[Q;X]$ *and* $\gamma^{-^1} \leq \alpha$. *Then* $P \cap \alpha = Q \cap \alpha \Rightarrow \forall \beta < \alpha^{+^0}\{\mathcal{C}^\beta(P) \cap \beta^{+^0} = \mathcal{C}^\beta(Q) \cap \beta^{+^0}\}$.

Proof. Assume that $P \cap \alpha = Q \cap \alpha$ and $\alpha \leq \beta < \alpha^{+^0}$. We obtain $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(P) = \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Q)$. On the other hand we have $\gamma^{-^1} \leq \alpha \leq \delta \in P \Rightarrow \delta \in \mathcal{C}^\delta(P)$. Hence $\mathcal{C}^\beta(P) = \mathcal{C}^\alpha(P)$ and similarly for $\mathcal{C}^\beta(Q)$ by Proposition 7.2.2. Therefore $\mathcal{C}^\beta(P) = \mathcal{C}^\beta(Q)$.

□

Proposition 7.7 *Let* $D_0^\gamma[P;X]$, $D_0^\gamma[Q;X]$ *and* $\gamma^{-^1} \leq \alpha$. *Then* $\alpha \leq P \,\&\, \alpha \leq Q \Rightarrow P \cap \alpha^{+^0} = Q \cap \alpha^{+^0}$.

Proof. We obtain $P \cap \gamma^{-^1} = X \cap \gamma^{-^1} = Q \cap \gamma^{-^1}$ and $Wo[P \cup Q]$. It suffices to show $Prg[R, P \cap Q]$ for $R = \{\beta \in P \cup Q : \gamma^{-^1} \leq \beta < \alpha^{+^0}\}$. Let $\gamma^{-^1} \leq \beta < \alpha^{+^0}$ with $\beta \in P$. Then $\beta \in W_0^\beta(P) \cap \beta^{+^0} = W(\mathcal{C}^\beta(P)) \cap \beta^{+^0}$. On the other hand we have $P \cap \beta = Q \cap \beta$ by IH. Proposition 7.6 yields $\mathcal{C}^\beta(P) \cap \beta^{+^0} = \mathcal{C}^\beta(Q) \cap \beta^{+^0}$, and hence $\beta \in W(\mathcal{C}^\beta(Q)) \cap \beta^{+^0} = W_0^\beta(Q) \cap \beta^{+^0}$. If $\beta \leq \alpha$, then $W_0^\beta(Q) \cap \beta^{+^0} = Q \cap \beta^{+^0}$ by $D_0^\gamma[Q;X]$ and $\gamma^{-^1} \leq \alpha \leq Q$. Hence $\beta \in Q$. Suppose $\alpha < \beta < \alpha^{+^0}$. Then $\mathcal{C}^\beta(Q) = \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Q)$ by Proposition 7.2.2. Therefore $\beta \in W_0^\alpha(Q) \cap \alpha^{+^0} = Q \cap \alpha^{+^0}$ by $D_0^\gamma[Q;X]$ and $\gamma^{-^1} \leq \alpha \leq Q$. The converse direction $\beta \in Q \Rightarrow \beta \in P$ is similarly seen. □

Lemma 7.8 (Σ_2^1-CA)
Suppose $Wo[X \cap \gamma^{-^1}]$. *Then* $\mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X)$ *is the maximal* 0*-distinguished* set *for* γ *and* X, *i.e.,* $D_0^\gamma[\mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X);X]$ *and* $\exists Y(Y = \mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X))$. *In particular* $\mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X) \cap \gamma^{+^1} = X \cap \gamma^{+^1}$.

Proof. $X \cap \gamma^{-^1} = \mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X) \cap \gamma^{-^1}$ is seen by the definition (43). Next let $D_0^\gamma[P;X]$ and $\gamma^{-^1} \leq \alpha \leq P$. We obtain $W_0^\alpha(P) \cap \alpha^{+^0} = P \cap \alpha^{+^0} \subset \mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X) \cap \alpha^{+^0}$ by (43). Let $D_0^\gamma[Q;X]$ and $\beta \in Q \cap \alpha^{+^0}$. We show $\beta \in P$. If $\gamma^{-^1} \leq \beta$, then $\beta \in Q \cap \beta^{+^0} = P \cap \beta^{+^0}$ by Proposition 7.7. Otherwise $\beta \in Q \cap \gamma^{-^1} = X \cap \gamma^{-^1} = P \cap \gamma^{-^1}$. Therefore we obtain $W_0^\alpha(P) \cap \alpha^{+^0} = P \cap \alpha^{+^0} = \mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X) \cap \alpha^{+^0}$. In particular $P \cap \alpha = \mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X) \cap \alpha$, and hence $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(P) = \mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X))$. Therefore $W_0^\alpha(P) = W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(P)) = W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X))) = W_0^\alpha(\mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X))$. This shows $D_0^\gamma[\mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X);X]$. The axiom Σ_2^1-CA yields $\exists Y(Y = \mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X))$. □

Lemma 7.9 *Let* $D_1[X]$ *and* $\gamma \in X \subset \mathbb{I}$. *Then* $\gamma \in W_1^\gamma(X) \cap \gamma^{+^1} = X \cap \gamma^{+^1}$, $\gamma \in W_0^\gamma(X) \cap \gamma^{+^0} = X \cap \gamma^{+^0}$ *and* $D_0^\gamma[X;X]$ *holds. In particular* $\gamma \in C^\gamma(X)$.

Proof. We obtain $\gamma \in W_1^\gamma(X) \cap \gamma^{+^1} = X \cap \gamma^{+^1}$ by $D_1[X]$ and $\gamma \in X$. Lemma 7.8 with $Wo[X]$ yields $D_0^\gamma[W_1^\gamma(X); X]$, and $D_0^\gamma[X; X]$ follows. We obtain $\gamma \in W_0^\gamma(X) \cap \gamma^{+^0} = X \cap \gamma^{+^0}$ by $\gamma^{-^1} \leq \gamma \in X$. □

Proposition 7.10 *Let $D_1[X]$, $\alpha \leq \gamma \in X$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)$. Then $\alpha \in X$.*

Proof. Lemma 7.9 with $\gamma^{+^0} \leq \gamma^{+^1}$ yields $\gamma \in W(\mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)) \cap \gamma^{+^0} = W_0^\gamma(X) \cap \gamma^{+^0} = X \cap \gamma^{+^0}$. $\gamma \geq \alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)$ yields $\alpha \in W_0^\gamma(X) \cap \gamma^{+^0} = X \cap \gamma^{+^0}$.

□

Proposition 7.11 *Let $D_1[X]$.*

1. *Let $\{\alpha, \beta\} \subset X$ with $\alpha + \beta = \alpha \# \beta$ and $\alpha > 0$. Then $\gamma = \alpha + \beta \in X$.*
2. *If $\{\alpha, \beta\} \subset X$, then $\varphi\alpha\beta \in X$.*

Proof. Proposition 7.11.2 is seen by main induction on $\alpha \in X$ with subsidiary induction on $\beta \in X$ using Proposition 7.11.1. We show Proposition 7.11.1. By Lemma 7.9 we obtain $\alpha \in X \cap \gamma^{+^0} = W_0^\gamma(X) \cap \gamma^{+^0}$ with $\gamma^{+^0} = \alpha^{+^0}$. We see that $\alpha + \beta \in W_0^\gamma(X) = W(\mathcal{C}^\gamma(X))$ by induction on $\beta \in X \cap \alpha \subset \mathcal{C}^\gamma(X)$. □

Lemma 7.12 *1. Let X and Y be 1-distinguished sets.*
Then $\gamma \leq X \,\&\, \gamma \leq Y \Rightarrow X \cap \gamma^{+^1} = Y \cap \gamma^{+^1}$.

2. *$\mathcal{W}$ is the 1-maximal distinguished class, i.e., $D_1[\mathcal{W}]$.*
3. *For a family $\{Y_j\}_{j \in J}$ of 1-distinguished sets, the union $Y = \bigcup_{j \in J} Y_j$ is also a 1-distinguished set.*

Proof. 7.12.1. Let $\gamma \leq X$ and $\gamma \leq Y$. By the definition (44) we obtain $\mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X) \cap \gamma^{+^1} = X \cap \gamma^{+^1}$ and $\mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(Y) \cap \gamma^{+^1} = Y \cap \gamma^{+^1}$. We show $Prg[(X \cup Y) \cap \gamma^{+^1}, X \cap Y]$. Let $\beta \in (X \cup Y) \cap \gamma^{+^1}$ and $X \cap \beta = Y \cap \beta$. First let $\gamma^{-^1} \leq \beta$. Then $\mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(X) = \mathcal{W}_1^\gamma(Y)$, and hence $\beta \in X \cap Y$. Second let $\beta^{-^1} \leq \beta < \gamma^{-^1} \leq \gamma$. We obtain $\mathcal{W}_1^\beta(X) = \mathcal{W}_1^\beta(Y)$, $\beta \leq X$ and $\beta \leq Y$. We obtain $X \cap \beta^{+^1} = \mathcal{W}_1^\beta(X) \cap \beta^{+^1} = \mathcal{W}_1^\beta(Y) \cap \beta^{+^1} = Y \cap \beta^{+^1}$ by the definition (44).
7.12.2 and 7.12.3. These follow from Lemma 7.12.1. □

Lemma 7.13 *1. $\mathcal{C}^\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \mathbb{I} = \mathcal{W} \cap \mathbb{I} = W(\mathcal{C}^\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{W})) \cap \mathbb{I}$.*

2. (BI) *For* each *$n < \omega$, $TI[\mathcal{C}^\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \omega_n(\mathbb{I} + 1)]$, i.e., for each class $\mathcal{X}$, $Prg[\mathcal{C}^\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{W}), \mathcal{X}] \to \mathcal{C}^\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \omega_n(\mathbb{I} + 1) \subset \mathcal{X}$.*
3. *For* each *$n < \omega$, $\mathcal{C}^\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \omega_n(\mathbb{I} + 1) \subset W(\mathcal{C}^\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{W}))$. In particular $\{\mathbb{I}, \omega_n(\mathbb{I} + 1)\} \subset W(\mathcal{C}^\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{W}))$.*

Proof. 7.13.1. $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \mathbb{I} \Rightarrow \alpha \in \mathcal{W}$ is seen by induction on $\ell\alpha$ using Proposition 7.11 and Lemma 7.12.2. Since $\mathcal{W}$ is well-founded, we obtain $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \mathbb{I} = W(\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})) \cap \mathbb{I}$.
7.13.2. We show $TI[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \omega_n(\mathbb{I}+1)]$ by metainduction on $n < \omega$. Let $D_1[Y]$. We obtain $Wo[Y]$, and $TI[Y]$ follows from (BI). We have $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \mathbb{I} = \mathcal{W} \cap \mathbb{I}$, and $\mathcal{W} \cap \gamma^{+^1} = Y \cap \gamma^{+^1}$ for $\gamma \in Y \cap \mathbb{I}$. We obtain $TI[\mathcal{W} \cap \mathbb{I}]$, from which $TI[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap (\mathbb{I}+1)]$ follows.

Assuming $TI[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \omega_n(\mathbb{I}+1)]$, $TI[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \omega_{n+1}(\mathbb{I}+1)]$ is seen from the fact $Prg[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}), A] \to Prg[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}), \mathtt{j}[A]]$, where $\mathtt{j}[A](\alpha)$denotes the formula $\forall\beta \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}) \left[\forall\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \beta A(\gamma) \to \forall\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap (\beta + \omega^\alpha) A(\gamma)\right]$ for a given formula A. □

7.2 Sets $\mathcal{G}^X$

In this subsection we establish a key fact, Lemma 7.27 on distinguished sets.

Definition 7.14 $\mathcal{G}^X := \{\alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I}) : \alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)\,\&\,\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \cap \alpha \subset X\}$.

Proposition 7.15 *Let $D_1[X]$ and $\alpha \in X$. Then $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}^X$.*

Proof. By Lemma 7.9 we obtain $\alpha \in W_0^\alpha(X) = W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X))$. Hence $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X)$. On the other side Proposition 7.10 yields $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \cap \alpha \subset X$. □

Lemma 7.16 (Σ^1_2-CA)
Suppose $D_1[Y]$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}^Y$. Let $X = \mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y) \cap \alpha^{+^1}$. Assume that the following condition (45) is fulfilled. Then $\alpha \in X$ and $D_1[X]$. In particular $\alpha \in \mathcal{W}$ holds.

Moreover if $Y = W_1^\gamma(Z)$ with $\alpha^{-^1} = \gamma^{-^1}$, then $\alpha \in Y$ holds.

$$\forall\beta \geq \alpha^{-^1} \left(Y \cap \alpha^{+^1} < \beta\,\&\,\beta^{+^0} < \alpha^{+^0} \to W_0^\beta(Y) \cap \beta^{+^0} \subset Y\right) \tag{45}$$

Proof. If $Y = W_1^\gamma(Z)$ with $\alpha^{-^1} = \gamma^{-^1}$, then $Y \cap \alpha^{-^1} = Z \cap \alpha^{-^1}$ and $W_1^\gamma(Z) = W_1^\alpha(Y)$. Hence if $\alpha \in W_1^\alpha(Y)$, then $\alpha \in Y$.

Let $P = W_0^\alpha(Y) \cap \alpha^{+^0} = W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y)) \cap \alpha^{+^0}$. By $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y) \cap \alpha \subset Y$ and $Wo[Y]$ we obtain

$$P \cap \alpha = Y \cap \alpha = \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y) \cap \alpha \tag{46}$$

Hence $\alpha \in P$.

Claim 7.17 $\alpha^{+^0} = \gamma^{+^0}\,\&\,\gamma \in P \Rightarrow \gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(P)$.

Proof of Claim 7.17. Let $\alpha^{+^0} = \gamma^{+^0}$ and $\gamma \in P = W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y)) \cap \alpha^{+^0}$. We obtain $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y) = \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y)$ by Propositions 7.15 and 7.2. Hence $Y \cap \gamma \subset \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y) \cap \gamma = \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y) \cap \gamma$. $\gamma \in W(\mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y))$ yields $Y \cap \gamma \subset P$. Therefore we obtain $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y) \subset \mathcal{C}^\gamma(P)$. □ of Claim 7.17.

Claim 7.18 *$D_0^\alpha[P; Y]$ and $\alpha \in X$.*

Proof of Claim 7.18. (46) yields $P \cap \alpha^{-^1} = Y \cap \alpha^{-^1}$. Let $\alpha^{-^1} \leq \beta \leq P$. We show $W_0^\beta(P) \cap \beta^{+^0} = P \cap \beta^{+^0}$.
Case 1. $\beta^{+^0} = \alpha^{+^0}$: We obtain $\mathcal{C}^\beta(P) = \mathcal{C}^\alpha(P)$ by Proposition 7.2 and Claim 7.17. Hence the assertion follows from (46).
Case 2. $\beta^{+^0} < \alpha^{+^0}$: Then $\beta^{+^0} \leq \alpha$. First let $Y \cap \alpha^{+^1} < \beta$. Then the assumption (45) with $\alpha^{-^1} \leq \beta$ yields $W_0^\beta(Y) \cap \beta^{+^0} \subset Y$. We obtain $W_0^\beta(P) \cap \beta^{+^0} = W_0^\beta(Y) \cap \beta^{+^0} \subset Y \cap \beta^{+^0} = P \cap \beta^{+^0}$ by (46). It remains to show $Y \cap \beta^{+^0} \subset W_0^\beta(Y)$. Let $\gamma \in Y \cap \beta^{+^0}$. We obtain $\gamma \in W_0^\gamma(Y)$ by Lemma 7.9. On the other hand we have $\mathcal{C}^\beta(Y) \subset \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y)$ by Propositions 7.15 and 7.2. Moreover (46) with Propositions 7.15 and 7.2 yields $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y) \subset \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$. Hence $\gamma \in W_0^\beta(Y)$.

Next let $\beta \leq Y \cap \alpha^{+^1}$. We obtain $Y \cap \beta^{+^1} = \mathcal{W}_1^\beta(Y) \cap \beta^{+^1}$, and $\beta^{-^1} = \alpha^{-^1} \leq \beta < \alpha^{+^1} = \beta^{+^1}$ with $\beta < \beta^{+^0} \leq \alpha < \beta^{+^1}$. On the other hand we have $D_0^\beta[\mathcal{W}_1^\beta(Y); Y]$ by Lemma 7.8. Therefore $P \cap \beta^{+^0} = Y \cap \beta^{+^0} = \mathcal{W}_1^\beta(Y) \cap \beta^{+^0} = W_0^\beta(\mathcal{W}_1^\beta(Y)) \cap \beta^{+^0} = W_0^\beta(P) \cap \beta^{+^0}$ by (46).

Thus $D_0^\alpha[P; Y]$ is shown. Hence $\alpha \in P \cap \alpha^{+^1} \subset \mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y) \cap \alpha^{+^1} = X$ for the maximal 0-distinguished set $\mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y)$ for α and Y. □ of Claim 7.18.

Claim 7.19 *Suppose* $\alpha^{-^1} \leq Y$. *Then* $\alpha \in Y$.

Proof. Let $\alpha^{-^1} \leq Y$. Then by $D_1[Y]$, $(\alpha^{-^1})^{-^1} = \alpha^{-^1}$, $(\alpha^{-^1})^{+^1} = \alpha^{+^1}$ and Claim 7.18, we obtain $\alpha \in X = \mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y) \cap \alpha^{+^1} = Y \cap \alpha^{+^1}$. □ of Claim 7.19.

Claim 7.20 $D_1[X]$.

Proof of Claim 7.20. Let $\beta \leq X = \mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y) \cap \alpha^{+^1}$. Then $\beta < \alpha^{+^1}$, and $\beta^{-^1} \leq \alpha^{-^1} < \alpha^{+^1}$. We show $\mathcal{W}_1^\beta(\mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y)) \cap \beta^{+^1} = \mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y) \cap \beta^{+^1}$.
Case 1. $\alpha^{-^1} \leq \beta$: By $\mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y) \cap \alpha^{-^1} = Y \cap \alpha^{-^1}$ with $Wo[Y]$, and $\alpha^{-^1} = \beta^{-^1}$ we obtain $\mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y) = \mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(\mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y)) = \mathcal{W}_1^\beta(\mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y))$.
Case 2. $\beta < \alpha^{-^1}$ and $\beta^{-^1} \leq Y$: We obtain $\beta^{+^1} \leq \alpha^{-^1}$. Hence $\mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y) \cap \beta^{+^1} = Y \cap \beta^{+^1} = \mathcal{W}_1^\beta(Y) \cap \beta^{+^1}$ by $D_1[Y]$. Therefore $\mathcal{W}_1^\beta(Y) = \mathcal{W}_1^\beta(\mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y))$. We obtain $\mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y) \cap \beta^{+^1} = \mathcal{W}_1^\beta(\mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y)) \cap \beta^{+^1}$.
Case 3. $\beta < \alpha^{-^1}$ and $Y < \beta^{-^1}$: Then $\beta^{+^1} \leq \alpha^{-^1}$. Lemma 7.8 yields $W_1^\beta(Y) \cap \beta^{+^1} = Y \cap \beta^{+^1}$. On the other hand we have $Y \cap \beta^{+^1} = \mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y) \cap \beta^{+^1}$ and $\mathcal{W}_1^\beta(Y) \cap \beta^{+^1} = \mathcal{W}_1^\beta(\mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y)) \cap \beta^{+^1}$. Therefore $\mathcal{W}_1^\beta(\mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y)) \cap \beta^{+^1} = \mathcal{W}_1^\alpha(Y) \cap \beta^{+^1}$. □ of Claim 7.20.

This completes a proof of Lemma 7.16. □

Lemma 7.21 *Assume* $D_1[Y]$, $\mathbb{I} > \mathbb{S} \in Y \cap (St \cup \{0\})$ *and* $\{0, \Omega\} \subset Y$. *Then* $\mathbb{S}^{+^1} = \mathbb{S}^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}$.

Proof. Let us verify the condition (45) in Lemma 7.16 for $\alpha = \mathbb{S}^{+^1}$. Let $\alpha^{-^1} \leq \beta$. Then $\alpha^{-^1} = \alpha \leq \beta$. Hence $\alpha^{+^0} \leq \beta^{+^0}$. (45) holds vacuously.

Thus it suffices to show that $\alpha = \mathbb{S}^{+^1} \in \mathcal{G}^Y$. $\alpha \in C^\alpha(Y)$ follows from $\mathbb{S} \in Y \cap \alpha$, cf. Definition 7.1.6. We show $\gamma \in C^\alpha(Y) \cap \alpha \Rightarrow \gamma \in Y$ by induction on $\ell\gamma$. By Proposition 7.11 and the assumption $\{0, \Omega\} \subset Y$, we can assume $\mathbb{S} \neq \gamma = \psi^f_\sigma(a) < \alpha = \mathbb{S}^\dagger < \sigma$ cf. Definitions 7.1.5 and 7.1.6. Suppose $\mathbb{S} < \gamma$. Then $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{H}_a(\gamma)$, and $\alpha = \mathbb{S}^\dagger \in \mathcal{H}_a(\gamma) \cap \sigma \subset \gamma$. We obtain $\gamma < \mathbb{S}$. Lemma 7.9 with $\mathbb{S} \in Y$ and $D_1[Y]$ yields $\mathbb{S} \in W^{\mathbb{S}}_0(Y) \cap \mathbb{S}^{+^0} = Y \cap \mathbb{S}^{+^0}$ for $W^{\mathbb{S}}_0(Y) = W(\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{S}}(Y))$, where $\forall\delta[\delta \in Y \Rightarrow \delta \in \mathcal{C}^\delta(Y)]$. We obtain $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{S}}(Y)$ by $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y)$, $\mathbb{S} < \alpha$ and Proposition 7.2 .1 Hence $\gamma \in W^{\mathbb{S}}_0(Y) \cap \mathbb{S}^{\dagger 0} \subset Y$ follows. Therefore $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}^Y$. □

Proposition 7.22 $\{0, \Omega\} \cup \{\Omega^{\dagger k} : 0 < k < \omega\} \subset \mathcal{W}$.

Proof. For each $\alpha \in \{0, \Omega\}$ and any set $Y \subset OT(\mathbb{I})$ we have $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y)$. First let $\alpha = 0$. We obtain $\mathcal{C}^0(\emptyset) \cap \alpha \subset \emptyset$, and $0 \in \mathcal{G}^\emptyset$. Moreover $D_1[\emptyset]$ and there is no β such that $\beta^{+^0} < \alpha^{+^0} = \Omega$ since Ω is the least regular term. Hence the condition (45) is fulfilled, and we obtain $0 \in X = \mathcal{W}^0_1(\emptyset) \cap 0^{+^1}$ with $D_1[X]$ by Lemma 7.16, and $D^0_0[P; \emptyset]$ for $P = \mathcal{W}^0_0(\emptyset) \cap \Omega$ by Claim 7.18.

Next let $\alpha = \Omega$. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \cap \alpha$. We show that $\gamma \in X$ by induction on $\ell\gamma$ as follows. We see that each strongly critical number $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \cap \alpha$ is in X from Definition 7.1 since none of $\mathbb{I}[\rho]$ and τ^{+^1} is below Ω, and if $\psi^f_\sigma(\beta) < \Omega = \alpha$, then $\sigma = \Omega$. Otherwise $\gamma \in X$ is seen from IH using Proposition 7.11 and $0 \in X$. Therefore we obtain $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}^X$. Let $\beta^{+^0} < \alpha^{+^0}$. Then $\beta^{+^0} = \Omega$ and $\beta < \Omega$. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{W}^\beta_0(X) \cap \Omega$. Then $\gamma \in W(\mathcal{C}^\beta(X)) \cap \Omega = W(\mathcal{C}^0(X)) \cap \Omega = W(\mathcal{C}^0(\emptyset)) \cap \Omega = P$. We obtain $\gamma \in P \subset \mathcal{W}^0_1(\emptyset) \cap 0^{+^1} = X$. Hence the condition (45) is fulfilled, and we obtain $\Omega \in \mathcal{W}$ by Lemma 7.16.

$\Omega^{\dagger k} \in \mathcal{W}$ is seen by induction on k from $0 \in \mathcal{W}$ and Lemma 7.21. □

Lemma 7.23 (Σ^1_3-DC)
If $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{W}}$, then there exists a 1-distinguished set Z *such that* $\{0, \Omega\} \subset Z$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}^Z$ *and* $\forall\mathbb{S} \in Z \cap (St \cup \{\Omega\})[\mathbb{S}^\dagger \in Z]$.

Proof. Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{W}}$. We have $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W})$. Pick a 1-distinguished set X_0 such that $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X_0)$. We can assume $\{0, \Omega\} \subset X_0$ by Proposition 7.22. On the other hand we have $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathcal{W}) \cap \alpha \subset \mathcal{W}$ and $\forall\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{W} \cap (St \cup \{\Omega\})[\mathbb{S}^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}]$ by Lemma 7.21. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall n \forall X \exists Y \{D_1[X] \to D_1[Y] \\ \wedge \quad & \forall\beta \in OT(\mathbb{I})\,(\ell\beta \leq n \wedge \beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(X) \cap \alpha \to \beta \in Y) \\ \wedge \quad & \forall\mathbb{S} \in (St \cup \{\Omega\})\,\big(\ell(\mathbb{S}) \leq n \wedge \mathbb{S} \in X \to \mathbb{S}^\dagger \in Y\big)\} \end{aligned}$$

Since $D_1[X]$ is Δ^1_3, Σ^1_3-DC yields a set Z such that $Z_0 = X_0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall n \{D_1[Z_n] \to D_1[Z_{n+1}] \\ \wedge \quad & \forall\beta \in OT(\mathbb{I})\,(\ell\beta \leq n \wedge \beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Z_n) \cap \alpha \to \beta \in Z_{n+1}) \\ \wedge \quad & \forall\mathbb{S} \in (St \cup \{\Omega\})\,\big(\ell(\mathbb{S}) \leq n \wedge \mathbb{S} \in Z_n \to \mathbb{S}^\dagger \in Z_{n+1}\big)\} \end{aligned}$$

Let $Z = \bigcup_n Z_n$. We see by induction on n that $D_1[Z_n]$ for every n. Lemma 7.12.3 yields $D_1[Z]$. Let $\beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Z) \cap \alpha$. Pick an n such that $\beta \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Z_n)$

and $\ell\beta \leq n$. We obtain $\beta \in Z_{n+1} \subset Z$. Therefore $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}^Z$. Furthermore let $\mathbb{S} \in Z \cap (St \cup \{\Omega\})$. Pick an n such that $\mathbb{S} \in Z_n$ and $\ell(\mathbb{S}) \leq n$. We obtain $\mathbb{S}^\dagger \in Z_{n+1} \subset Z$. □

Remark 7.24 Lemma 7.23 is a Σ^1_4-statement, which is proved in Σ^1_3-DC. Alternatively we could prove the lemma in Σ^1_3-AC if we assign fundamental sequences to limit ordinals as in [8].

Proposition 7.25 *Let $D_1[Y]$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$. Assume $Y \cap \beta < \delta$. Then $F_\delta(\alpha) \subset \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$.*

Proof. By induction on $\ell\alpha$. Let $\{0, \Omega, \mathbb{I}\} \ni \alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$. First consider the case $\alpha \notin \mathcal{E}(\alpha)$. If $\alpha \in Y \cap \beta \subset \mathcal{G}^Y$ by Proposition 7.15, then $\mathcal{E}(\alpha) \subset \mathcal{C}^\alpha(Y) \cap \alpha \subset Y \subset \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$ by Proposition 7.5. Otherwise we have $\alpha \notin \mathcal{E}(\alpha) \subset \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$. In each case IH yields $F_\delta(\alpha) = F_\delta(\mathcal{E}(\alpha)) \subset \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$.

Let $\alpha = \psi^f_\pi(a)$ for some π, f, a. If $\alpha < \delta$, then $F_\delta(\alpha) = \{\alpha\}$, and there is nothing to prove. Let $\alpha \geq \delta$. Then $F_\delta(\alpha) = F_\delta(\{\pi, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f))$. On the other side we see $\{\pi, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$ from $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$ and the assumption. IH yields $F_\delta(\alpha) \subset \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$. □

Proposition 7.26 *Let $\gamma < \beta$. Assume $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y)$ and $G_\beta(\alpha) < \gamma$. Moreover assume $\forall\delta[\ell\delta \leq \ell\alpha \,\&\, \delta \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y) \cap \gamma \Rightarrow \delta \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)]$. Then $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$.*

Proof. By induction on $\ell\alpha$. If $\alpha < \gamma$, then $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y) \cap \gamma$. The third assumption yields $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$. Assume $\alpha \geq \gamma$. Consider the case $\alpha = \psi^f_\pi(a)$ for some $\{\pi, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y)$ and $\pi > \gamma$. If $\pi \leq \beta$, then $\{\alpha\} = G_\beta(\alpha) < \gamma$ by the second assumption. Hence this is not the case, and we obtain $\pi > \beta$. Then $G_\beta(\{\pi, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)) = G_\beta(\alpha) < \gamma$. IH yields $\{\pi, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$. We conclude $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$ from $\pi > \beta$.

Next let $\alpha = \mathbb{I}[\rho], \rho^{\dagger n} \geq \gamma$ with $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y)$. If $\alpha < \beta$, then $\{\alpha\} = G_\beta(\alpha) < \gamma$, and this is not the case. Let $\alpha \geq \beta$. Then $G_\beta(\alpha) = G_\beta(\rho)$. IH yields $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$, and $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$ by $\alpha \geq \beta$. □

The following Lemma 7.27 is a key result on distinguished classes.

Lemma 7.27 *Suppose $D_1[Y]$ with $\{0, \Omega\} \subset Y$, and for $\eta \in OT(\mathbb{I})$, cf. Definition 6.11,*

$$\eta \in \mathcal{G}^Y \tag{47}$$

$$R(\eta) \cap \{\gamma \in OT(\mathbb{I}) : Y \cap \eta^{+^1} < \gamma\} \cap \mathcal{G}^Y \subset Y \tag{48}$$

Then $\eta \in \mathcal{W}$. Moreover if $Y = W^\gamma_1(Z)$ with $\eta^{-^1} = \gamma^{-^1}$, then $\eta \in Y$ holds.

Proof. By Lemma 7.16 and the hypothesis (47) it suffices to show (45), i.e.,

$$\forall\beta \left(Y \cap \eta^{+^1} < \beta \,\&\, \beta^{+^0} < \eta^{+^0} \to W^\beta_0(Y) \cap \beta^{+^0} \subset Y\right).$$

Assume $Y \cap \eta^{+^1} < \beta$ and $\beta^{+^0} < \eta^{+^0}$. We have to show $W(\mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)) \cap \beta^{+^0} = W_0^\beta(Y) \cap \beta^{+^0} \subset Y$. We prove this by induction on $\gamma \in W(\mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)) \cap \beta^{+^0}$. Suppose $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y) \cap \beta^{+^0}$ and

$$\text{MIH} : \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y) \cap \gamma \subset Y.$$

We show $\gamma \in Y$. We can assume that

$$Y \cap \eta^{+^1} < \gamma \tag{49}$$

since if $\gamma \leq \delta$ for some $\delta \in Y \cap \eta^{+^1}$, then by $Y \cap \eta^{+^1} < \beta$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$ we obtain $\delta < \beta$, $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\delta(Y)$ and $\delta \in W(\mathcal{C}^\delta(Y)) \cap \delta^{+^0} = Y \cap \delta^{+^0}$ by Lemma 7.9. Hence $\gamma \in W(\mathcal{C}^\delta(Y)) \cap \delta^{+^0} \subset Y$.

Moreover we can assume $\gamma \notin St \cap \beta$. For otherwise $\gamma \in (\mathcal{C}^\beta(Y) \cap \beta) \cap St \subset Y$ by Definitions 7.1.5 and 7.1.6.

We show first

$$\gamma \in \mathcal{G}^Y \tag{50}$$

First $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y)$ by $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y) \cap \beta^{+^0}$ and Proposition 7.2. Second we show the following claim by induction on $\ell\alpha$:

$$\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y) \cap \gamma \Rightarrow \alpha \in Y \tag{51}$$

Proof of (51). Assume $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y) \cap \gamma$. We can assume $\gamma^{+^0} \leq \beta$ for otherwise we have $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y) \cap \gamma = \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y) \cap \gamma \subset Y$ by MIH.

By induction hypothesis on lengths, Proposition 7.11, and $\{0, \Omega\} \subset Y$, we can assume that $\alpha = \psi_\pi^f(a)$ for some $\pi > \gamma$ such that $\{\pi, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y)$ since $\mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y) \cap \gamma \cap St \subset Y$ by Definitions 7.1.5 and 7.1.6.

Case 1. $\beta < \pi$: Then $G_\beta(\{\pi, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)) = G_\beta(\alpha) < \alpha < \gamma$ by Proposition 6.17.1. Proposition 7.26 with induction hypothesis on lengths yields $\{\pi, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$. Hence $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y) \cap \gamma$ by $\pi > \beta$. MIH yields $\alpha \in Y$.

Case 2. $\beta \geq \pi$: We have $\alpha < \gamma < \pi \leq \beta$. It suffices to show that $\alpha \leq Y \cap \eta^{+^1}$. Then by (49) we have $\alpha \leq \delta \in Y \cap \eta^{+^1}$ for some $\delta < \gamma$. $\mathcal{C}^\delta(Y) \ni \alpha \leq \delta \in Y \cap \delta^{+^0} = W(\mathcal{C}^\delta(Y)) \cap \delta^{+^0}$ yields $\alpha \in W(\mathcal{C}^\delta(Y)) \cap \delta^{+^0} \subset Y$.

Consider first the case $\gamma \notin \mathcal{E}(\gamma)$. By $\alpha = \psi_\pi^f(a) < \gamma < \pi$, we can assume that $\gamma \notin \{0, \Omega, \mathbb{I}\}$. Then let $\delta = \max S(\gamma)$ denote the largest immediate subterm of γ. Then $\delta \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y) \cap \gamma$, and by (49), $Y \cap \eta^{+^1} < \gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$ we have $\delta \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y) \cap \gamma$. Hence $\delta \in Y$ by MIH. Also by $\alpha < \gamma$, we obtain $\alpha \leq \delta$, i.e., $\alpha \leq Y$, and we are done.

Next let $\gamma = \psi_\kappa^g(b)$ for some b, g and $\kappa > \beta$ by (49) and $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$. We have $\alpha < \gamma < \pi \leq \beta < \kappa$. Let $\pi \preceq \rho$ and $\kappa \preceq \tau$ with $\{\rho, \tau\} \subset St$. We see $\rho = \tau$ by Proposition 3.29.

$\pi \notin \mathcal{H}_b(\gamma)$ since otherwise by $\pi < \kappa$ we would have $\pi < \gamma$. Then by Proposition 3.20 we have $a \geq b$ and $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \cup \{\kappa, b\} \not\subset \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha)$. On the other hand we have $K_\gamma(SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \cup \{\kappa, b\}) < b \leq a$, i.e., $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \cup \{\kappa, b\} \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\gamma)$. By Proposition 6.18 pick a $\delta \in F_\gamma(SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \cup \{\kappa, b\})$ such that $\mathcal{H}_a(\alpha) \not\ni \delta \in \gamma$. In particular $\delta < \gamma$. Also we have $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \cup \{\kappa, b\} \subset \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y)$, $Y \subset \mathcal{G}^Y$ by Proposition 7.15,

and $Y \cap \eta^{+^1} < \gamma$ by (49). Therefore by Proposition 7.25 with MIH we obtain $\alpha \leq \delta \in \mathcal{C}^\beta(Y) \cap \gamma \subset Y$. $\square$ of (51) and (50).

Hence we obtain $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}^Y$. We have $\gamma < \beta^{+^0} \leq \eta$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y)$. If $\gamma \in R(\eta)$, then the hypothesis (48) yields $\gamma \in Y$. In what follows assume $\gamma \notin R(\eta)$.

If $G_\eta(\gamma) < \gamma$, then Proposition 7.26 yields $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\eta(Y) \cap \eta \subset Y$ by $\eta \in \mathcal{G}^Y$.

Suppose $G_\eta(\gamma) = \{\gamma\}$. This means, by $\gamma \notin St$ and $\gamma \not\prec \eta$, that $\gamma \prec \tau$ for a $\tau < \eta$. If $\eta \prec \mathbb{I}$, then $\gamma \prec \mathbb{I}$ by $\gamma \notin R(\eta)$. Hence this is not the case. Let τ denote the maximal such one. We have $\gamma < \tau < \eta$ and $\tau \notin SSt$ and $\tau \in \Psi$ by $\gamma \notin R(\eta)$ and Proposition 6.12. From $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y)$ we see $\tau \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Y)$. Next we show that

$$G_\eta(\tau) < \gamma \tag{52}$$

Let $\tau = \psi^f_\kappa(b)$. Then $\eta < \kappa$ by the maximality of τ, and $G_\eta(\tau) = G_\eta(\{\kappa, b\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)) < \tau$ by Proposition 6.17.1. On the other hand we have $\tau \in \mathcal{H}_a(\gamma)$. Proposition 6.17.2 yields $G_\eta(\tau) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\gamma)$. We see $G_\eta(\tau) < \gamma$ inductively.

(52) is shown. Proposition 7.26 yields $\tau \in \mathcal{C}^\eta(Y)$, and $\tau \in \mathcal{C}^\eta(Y) \cap \eta \subset Y$ by $\eta \in \mathcal{G}^Y$. Therefore $Y \cap \eta^{+^1} < \gamma < \tau \in Y$. This is not the case by (49). We are done. $\square$

Proposition 7.28 *For $\alpha_1 = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(a)$, $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{W}} \Rightarrow \alpha_1 \in \mathcal{W}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 7.23 pick a 1-distinguished set Z such that $\{0, \Omega\} \subset Z$, $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{G}^Z$ and $\forall \mathbb{S} \in Z \cap (St \cup \{\Omega\})[\mathbb{S}^\dagger \in Z]$.

Claim 7.29 *Let $\rho < \alpha_1$ and $\mathcal{G}^Z \ni \gamma \prec^R \kappa$ for a $\kappa \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho]\} \cup \{\rho^{\dagger k} : k > 0\}$. Then $\gamma < Z \cap \alpha_1$.*

Proof of Claim 7.29. Let $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}^{\dagger k} < \alpha_1$ for an $\mathbb{S} \in LSt \cup \{\Omega\}$ and a $k > 0$. We show $\rho \in Z$ by induction on $\ell\gamma$. First let $\gamma = \psi_{\mathbb{I}[\sigma]}(b)$ for some b and $\sigma \preceq^R \kappa$. Then we obtain $\mathbb{I}[\sigma] \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Z)$ by $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Z)$, and $\sigma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Z) \cap \gamma \subset Z$. Proposition 7.15 yields $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}^Z$. If $\sigma = \kappa = \mathbb{I}[\rho]$, then $\sigma \in \mathcal{C}^\sigma(Z)$ yields $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^\sigma(Z) \cap \sigma \subset Z$. Otherwise IH yields $\rho \in Z$. Second let $\gamma = \psi^f_{\sigma^\dagger}(b) \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Z)$ for some f, b and $\sigma^\dagger \preceq^R \kappa$. We obtain $\sigma \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma(Z) \cap \gamma \subset Z$, and $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}^Z$. If $\sigma^\dagger = \kappa = \rho^\dagger$, then $\rho = \sigma \in Z$. Otherwise IH yields $\rho \in Z$.

Now $\rho \in Z$ yields $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^\rho(Z)$, and this yields $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{C}^\rho(Z) \cap \rho \subset Z$. Since Z is closed under $\mathbb{T} \mapsto \mathbb{T}^\dagger$, we obtain $\gamma < \mathbb{S}^{\dagger k} \in Z \cap \alpha_1$. $\square$ of Claim 7.29.

Since there is no $\gamma \prec \alpha_1$, we conclude $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{W}$ by Lemma 7.27. $\square$

Lemma 7.30 *For* each $n < \omega$, *the following holds:*

Let $a \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \omega_n(\mathbb{I}+1)$ with $\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(a) \in OT(\mathbb{I})$. Then $\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(a) \in \mathcal{W}$ holds.

Proof. For each $n < \omega$, we have $TI[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap (\omega_n(\mathbb{I}+1))]$ by Lemma 7.13.2. We show the lemma by induction on $a \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \omega_n(\mathbb{I}+1)$. Assume

$$\mathrm{IH} :\Leftrightarrow \forall b \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap a\, (\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b) \in OT(\mathbb{I}) \Rightarrow \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b) \in \mathcal{W})$$

Let $\alpha_1 = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(a) \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ with $a \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \omega_n(\mathbb{I}+1)$. By Proposition 7.28 it suffices to show $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{W}}$.

From $a \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})$ with $\alpha_1 < \mathbb{I}$ we see $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W})$. It suffices to show the following claim by induction on $\ell\beta_1$.

$$\forall \beta_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \alpha_1 [\beta_1 \in \mathcal{W}]. \tag{53}$$

Proof of (53). Assume $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \alpha_1$ and let

$$\mathrm{LIH} :\Leftrightarrow \forall \gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \alpha_1 [\ell\gamma < \ell\beta_1 \Rightarrow \gamma \in \mathcal{W}].$$

We show $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{W}$. We can assume $\beta_1 \notin \{0, \Omega\}$ by Proposition 7.22.
Case 1. $\beta_1 \notin \mathcal{E}(\beta_1)$: Assume $\beta_1 \notin \mathcal{W}$. Then $\beta_1 \neq \mathbb{I}[\rho], \rho^\dagger$ for any ρ by $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \alpha_1$ and Definition 7.1. We obtain $S(\beta_1) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \alpha_1$. LIH yields $S(\beta_1) \subset \mathcal{W}$. Hence we conclude $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{W}$ from Proposition 7.11.

Case 2. In what follows consider the cases when $\beta_1 = \psi^g_\pi(b)$ for some π, b, g. We can assume $\pi > \alpha_1$. Then we see $\pi = \mathbb{I}$ and $\beta_1 = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)$ with $b \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W})$. We obtain $b < a$ by Proposition 3.10.1, and $b \in \mathcal{H}_b(\beta_1)$. By IH it suffices to show $b \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})$.

By induction on ℓc we see that $c \in \mathcal{H}_b(\beta_1) \Rightarrow G_{\mathbb{I}}(c) < \beta_1$. For example let $c = \gamma_1^{\dagger m}$ with $\gamma_1 \in LS \cup \{\Omega\}$ and $m > 0$. Suppose $c > \beta_1$. Then $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{H}_b(\beta_1)$. IH yields $\{\gamma_1\} = G_{\mathbb{I}}(\gamma_1) < \beta_1 \in LS$, and hence $\{c\} = G_{\mathbb{I}}(c) < \beta_1$.

In particular we obtain $G_{\mathbb{I}}(b) < \beta_1$. Proposition 7.26 with LIH yields $b \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})$. This shows (53). □

7.3 Layers of stable ordinals

In this subsection we examine ordinals in layers $L(\mathbb{S}) = \{\alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I}) : \alpha \prec^R \mathbb{S}\}$ for $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$.

We show that there is no infinite sequence $\{\rho_n, \kappa_n\}_n$ such that $\rho_0 \prec \mathbb{S}$, $\kappa_n \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho_n]\} \cup \{\rho_n^{\dagger k} : k > 0\}$ and either $\rho_{n+1} \prec \rho_n^{\dagger k} = \kappa_n$ or $\rho_{n+1} \prec \tau^{\dagger k}$ for $\tau \prec \mathbb{I}[\rho_n] = \kappa_n$ and $k > 0$, cf. Lemma 7.34. Here we need the condition (11) and the fact that $\alpha \in M_\rho$ if α is in the domain of the Mostowski collapsing $\alpha \mapsto \alpha[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$, cf. Definition 3.24 and Proposition 7.33.

Let $k(\psi^f_\kappa(a)) = \{\kappa, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)$ and $\mathfrak{h}(\psi^f_\kappa(a)) = \{a, \mathfrak{g}^*_0(\psi^f_\kappa(a))\}$.

Proposition 7.31 *Let Z be a 1-distinguished set such that $\{0, \Omega\} \subset Z$ and $\forall \mathbb{S} \in Z \cap (St \cup \{\Omega\})[\mathbb{S}^\dagger \in Z]$. Assume $\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b) \in Z$ and for $\gamma^{\dagger 0} = \gamma$*

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{MIH}(b; Z) :\Leftrightarrow \forall \mathbb{T} \in (St \cup \{\Omega\}) \cap Z \forall \gamma \in L(\mathbb{T}^\dagger) \cap \Psi \\ &\left[k(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z) \,\&\, \mathfrak{h}(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z) \cap b \Rightarrow \{\mathbb{I}[\gamma]\} \cup \{\gamma^{\dagger k} : k < \omega\} \subset Z\right].\end{aligned}$$

Then for any $\Theta \subset Z$, $\mathcal{H}_b(\Theta) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z)$ holds.

Proof. Let $\Theta \subset Z$. Assuming $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_b(\Theta)$, we show $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z)$ by induction on $\ell\gamma$. Let $\gamma \notin \Theta$. By IH and Proposition 7.11, we can assume $\gamma = \psi^f_\kappa(a)$ with

$k(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{H}_b(\Theta)$. IH yields $\{\kappa, a\} \subset k(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z)$. If $\kappa = \mathbb{I}$ and $f = \emptyset$, then we obtain $\gamma = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(a) < \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b) = \delta \in Z$. $a \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\delta}(Z)$ yields $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\delta}(Z) \cap \delta \subset Z$.

Let $\kappa < \mathbb{I}$ and $\gamma \in L(\mathbb{S})$ with $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{T}^{\dagger}$ and $\mathbb{T} \in St \cup \{\Omega\}$. We claim that $\mathbb{T} \in Z$ and $\mathtt{h}(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z) \cap b$. We have $\kappa \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z) \cap \mathbb{I} \subset Z$. We obtain $\kappa \in \mathcal{G}^{Z}$. Let $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$ be such that either $\rho = \kappa$ or $\kappa \prec^{R} \sigma \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho]\} \cup \{\rho^{\dagger k} : k > 0\}$. We obtain $\rho \in Z$, and $\rho \in \mathcal{G}^{Z}$, from which we see $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z)$, and $\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z) \cap \rho \subset Z$.

On the other, IH yields $a \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z) \cap b$. We show $\mathtt{g}_0^*(\gamma) \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z) \cap b$.

If $\gamma \prec \mathbb{S}$, then $\mathtt{g}_0^*(\gamma) = \mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\gamma_0)$ for $\gamma \preceq \gamma_0 = \psi_{\mathbb{S}}^{g}(c)$. IH with $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\gamma_0) \in \mathcal{H}_b(\Theta)$ yields $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\gamma_0) \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z)$. On the other hand we have $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\gamma_0) < b$ by $\gamma_0 \in \mathcal{H}_b(\Theta)$.

Next let $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$ and $\gamma \prec^{R} \sigma \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho]\} \cup \{\rho^{\dagger k} : k > 0\}$. Then $\mathtt{g}_0^*(\gamma) = \mathtt{g}_0^*(\rho)$. We obtain $\rho \in \mathcal{H}_b(\Theta)$. IH yields $\mathtt{g}_0^*(\rho) \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z) \cap b$.

Therefore MIH$(b; Z)$ yields $\{\mathbb{I}[\gamma]\} \cup \{\gamma^{\dagger k} : k < \omega\} \subset Z$. □

Proposition 7.32 *1. Let $\gamma_1 = \gamma[\rho/\mathbb{S}]^{-1}$ and $\{\mathbb{S}, \gamma\} \subset \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z)$. Then $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z)$.*

2. $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}_b(\rho) \cap \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z) \Rightarrow \gamma \in \mathcal{H}_b(\mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z) \cap \rho)$.

Proof. Both are seen by induction on $\ell\gamma$. For Proposition 7.32.1, use the fact $\gamma_1 = \gamma[\rho/\mathbb{S}]^{-1} \geq \gamma$. □

Proposition 7.33 *Let $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$, $\eta \in L(\mathbb{S})$ and Z be a 1-distinguished set such that $\{0, \Omega\} \subset Z$, $\forall \mathbb{U} \in Z \cap (St \cup \{\Omega\})[\mathbb{U}^{\dagger} \in Z]$. Assume $\eta \in \mathcal{G}^{Z}$, $\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b) \in Z$ and* MIH$(b; Z)$ *in Proposition 7.31 for a $b \geq \mathtt{g}_0^*(\eta)$. Then the following holds.*

1. $\mathtt{g}_0(\eta) \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z)$.

2. $\mathtt{g}_1(\eta) \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z)$.

3. $\mathtt{g}_2(\eta) \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z)$.

Proof. Proposition 7.33.2 is seen from Proposition 7.33.1 by induction on $\ell\eta$.
7.33.1. Let $\eta \in \Psi$.
Case 1. $\eta = \rho$ or $\eta = \psi_{\mathbb{I}[\rho]}(c)$ for a $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$ and a c: Then $\mathtt{p}_0(\rho) \leq \mathtt{g}_0(\rho) = \mathtt{g}_0(\eta) = \mathtt{g}_0^*(\eta) \leq b$. We show $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho) = \mathtt{g}_0(\rho) \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z)$. By (11) in Definition 3.23.6 we have $\mathtt{p}_0(\rho) \in \mathcal{H}_b(\rho)$, and $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho) \in \mathcal{H}_b(\rho)$. On the other hand we have $\rho \in \mathcal{G}^{Z}$. We obtain $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho) \in \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z)$ by $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z)$, and $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho) \in \mathcal{H}_b(\mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z) \cap \rho)$ by Proposition 7.32.2. Moreover we have $\mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z) \cap \rho \subset Z$. Proposition 7.31 with MIH$(b; Z)$ yields $\mathtt{p}_{\mathbb{S}}(\rho) \in \mathcal{H}_b(\mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z) \cap \rho) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z)$.
Case 2. Otherwise: Let $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$ be such that $\eta \prec^{R} \tau \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho\} \cup \{\rho^{\dagger m} : m > 0\}$. Let $\eta_1 \in M_{\rho}$ be such that $\eta = \eta_1[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$. Then $\mathtt{g}_0(\eta) = \mathtt{g}_0(\eta_1)$ and $\mathtt{p}_0(\rho) \leq \mathtt{g}_0(\rho) = \mathtt{g}_0^*(\eta) \leq b$.

On the other hand we have $\eta \in \mathcal{G}^{Z}$. $\eta \in \mathcal{C}^{\eta}(Z)$ yields $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^{\eta}(Z) \cap \eta \subset Z$. Hence $\rho \in Z$. We obtain $\rho \in \mathcal{G}^{Z}$. We see $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z)$ from $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z)$. Hence $\{\mathbb{S}, \eta\} \subset \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z)$. Proposition 7.32.1 yields $\eta_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z)$, and $\mathtt{g}_0(\eta_1) \in \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z)$ by $\eta_1 > \rho$. $\eta_1 \in M_{\rho} \subset \mathcal{H}_b(\rho)$ yields $\mathtt{g}_0(\eta_1) \in \mathcal{H}_b(\rho)$. We obtain $\mathtt{g}_0(\eta_1) \in \mathcal{H}_a(\mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z) \cap \rho)$ by Proposition 7.32.2. $\rho \in \mathcal{G}^{Z}$ yields $\mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z) \cap \rho \subset Z$. Hence Proposition 7.31 yields $\mathtt{g}_0(\eta_1) \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z)$.

7.33.3. By induction on $\ell\eta$. Let $\eta \in \Psi$.
Case 1. $\eta = \rho \prec \mathbb{S}$: Then $\mathtt{p}_0(\rho) = \mathtt{p}_0(\eta)$. Let $f = m(\rho)$ and $\zeta \geq b \geq \mathtt{p}_0(\eta)$. Then $\mathtt{g}_2(\rho) = o_{\mathbb{S}}(f) + 1$ and $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_b(\rho)$ by (11) in Definition 3.23.6. Moreover $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z)$ by $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z)$. Hence we obtain $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{H}_b(\mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z) \cap \rho)$ by Proposition 7.32.2, where $\mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z) \cap \rho \subset Z$. Proposition 7.31 with MIH$(\zeta; Z)$ yields $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z)$, and $o_{\mathbb{S}}(f) \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z)$.
Case 2. Otherwise: Let $\rho \prec \mathbb{S}$ be such that $\eta = \eta_1[\rho/\mathbb{S}]$ with $\eta_1 \in M_\rho \cap L(\mathbb{S}_1)$ and $\mathtt{g}_0(\eta_1) = \mathtt{g}_0(\eta)$, where $\eta \prec^R (\mathbb{S}_1[\rho/\mathbb{S}])$ and $M_\rho \subset \mathcal{H}_b(\rho)$ for $\mathtt{p}_0(\rho) \leq \mathtt{g}_0(\rho) = \mathtt{g}^*_0(\eta) \leq b$. Then $\ell\eta_1 < \ell\eta$. $\eta \in \mathcal{C}^{\eta}(Z)$ with $\rho < \eta$ yields $\eta \in \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z)$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^{\eta}(Z) \cap \eta \subset Z$. We see $\mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z)$ from $\rho \in \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z)$. We obtain $\eta_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z)$ by Proposition 7.32.1 and $\eta \in \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z)$, and $\eta_1 \in \mathcal{H}_b(\mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z) \cap \rho)$ by Proposition 7.32.2. On the other hand we have $\mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z) \cap \rho \subset Z$. By Proposition 7.31 we obtain $\eta_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z) \cap \mathbb{I} \subset Z$. Hence $\eta_1 \in \mathcal{G}^Z$. Moreover we see $\mathtt{g}^*_0(\eta_1) < b = \mathtt{p}_0(\rho) \leq \mathtt{g}^*_0(\eta)$ from $\eta_1 \in \mathcal{H}_b(\rho)$. IH yields $\mathtt{g}_2(\eta) = \mathtt{g}_2(\eta_1) \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z)$. □

Lemma 7.34 *Let $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{T}^\dagger \in SSt$ with $\mathbb{T} \in St \cup \{\Omega\}$, $\mathbb{T} \leq \eta \in L(\mathbb{S})$, and Z be a 1-distinguished set such that $\{0, \Omega, \mathbb{T}\} \subset Z$, $\forall \mathbb{U} \in Z \cap (St \cup \{\Omega\})[\mathbb{U}^\dagger \in Z]$. Assume $\eta \in \mathcal{G}^Z$, $b \geq \mathtt{g}^*_0(\eta)$, $\Lambda = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b) \in Z$, and* MIH$(b; Z)$ *in Proposition 7.31. Then $\eta \in Z$.*

Proof. By Lemma 6.13 we obtain $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathtt{g}_2(\eta)) \subset \Lambda = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)$. An ordinal $\mathtt{g}^{\Lambda}_2(\eta) = o_\Lambda(f) + 1 < \mathbb{I}$ is obtained from $\mathtt{g}_2(\eta) = o_{\mathbb{I}}(f) + 1$ in Definition 6.1.2 by changing the base $\mathbb{I}$ by Λ. Then for $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathtt{g}_2(\gamma)) \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathtt{g}_2(\delta)) \subset \Lambda$, $\mathtt{g}_2(\delta) < \mathtt{g}_2(\gamma) \Leftrightarrow \mathtt{g}^{\Lambda}_2(\delta) < \mathtt{g}^{\Lambda}_2(\gamma)$ by Proposition 3.3, and $\mathtt{g}_2(\gamma) \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z) \Leftrightarrow \mathtt{g}^{\Lambda}_2(\gamma) \in Z$ by the assumption $\Lambda \in Z$.

On the other side, we see $W^{\mathbb{T}}_1(Z) \cap \mathbb{S} = Z \cap \mathbb{S}$ from $\mathbb{T} \in Z$ and $D_1[Z]$. Hence $\mathcal{G}^Y \cap \mathbb{S} = \mathcal{G}^Z \cap \mathbb{S}$ for $Y = W^{\mathbb{T}}_1(Z) \cap \mathbb{S}$.

We see $Wo[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z)]$ from $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z) \cap \mathbb{I} = Z \cap \mathbb{I}$ as in Lemma 7.13. We show $\eta \in Z \cap \mathbb{S} = W^{\mathbb{T}}_1(Z) \cap \mathbb{S}$ by induction on $\mathtt{g}^{\Lambda}(\eta) = (\mathtt{g}_1(\eta), \mathtt{g}^{\Lambda}_2(\eta))$ with respect to the lexicographic order $<_{lx}$ on $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(Z) \times Z$.

Let $\gamma \in R(\eta)$ be such that $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}^Z$. Then $\gamma \in R(\eta) \subset L(\mathbb{S})$, $\mathbb{T} = \gamma^{-1} = \eta^{-1}$ and $\mathbb{T} < \gamma < \eta < \mathbb{S}$. By Lemma 6.13 we obtain $\mathtt{g}^*_0(\gamma) \leq \mathtt{g}^*_0(\eta)$, $\mathtt{g}(\gamma) <_{lx} \mathtt{g}(\eta)$ and $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(\mathtt{g}_2(\gamma)) \subset \Lambda = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)$. Proposition 7.33 yields $\{\mathtt{g}_1(\gamma), \mathtt{g}_2(\gamma), \mathtt{g}_1(\eta), \mathtt{g}_2(\eta)\} \subset C^{\mathbb{I}}(Z)$. We obtain $\mathtt{g}^{\Lambda}(\gamma) <_{lx} \mathtt{g}^{\Lambda}(\eta)$. IH yields $\gamma \in Z$, and (48) is shown. Lemma 7.27 yields $\eta \in Z$. □

Proposition 7.35 *Let $D_1[Z]$ and $\rho \in L(\mathbb{S}) \cap Z \cap \Psi$ with an $\mathbb{S} \in SSt$. Then $\{\mathbb{I}[\rho]\} \cup \{\rho^{\dagger k} : k > 0\} \subset \mathcal{G}^Z$.*

Proof. Let $\alpha \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho]\} \cup \{\rho^{\dagger k} : k > 0\}$. We obtain $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha}(Z)$ by $\rho \in Z \cap \alpha$. We show $\beta \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha}(Z) \cap \alpha \Rightarrow \alpha \in Z$ by induction on $\ell\beta$. Let $\rho \neq \beta \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha}(Z) \cap \alpha$. If $\beta < \rho$, then $\beta \in \mathcal{C}^{\rho}(Z) \cap \rho \subset Z$ by Propositions 7.2.1 and 7.15. Let $\rho < \beta < \alpha$. By IH, Proposition 7.11 and Definition 7.1 we may assume that $\beta = \psi^f_\sigma(c)$ with $\sigma > \alpha$. Then $\beta < \rho$ by Proposition 3.29. □

Corollary 7.36 *For* each $\zeta \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})$*, the following holds:*

Let $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{T}^\dagger \in SSt$ *with* $\mathbb{T} \in St \cup \{\Omega\}$, $\eta \in \{\mathbb{I}[\rho]\} \cup \{\rho^{\dagger k} : k > 0\}$ *with* $\rho \in L(\mathbb{S})$, *and* $\{\mathbb{T}, \rho\} \subset \mathcal{W}$. *Assume* $\zeta \geq \mathrm{g}_0^*(\eta)$ *and* $\mathrm{MIH}(\zeta; \mathcal{W})$ *in Proposition 7.31. Then* $\eta \in \mathcal{W}$.

Proof. By $\mathrm{g}_0^*(\eta) \leq \zeta \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})$ and Lemma 7.30 we obtain $\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(\zeta) \in \mathcal{W}$. As in the proof of Lemma 7.23 we see that there exists a 1-distinguished set Z such that $\{0, \Omega, \mathbb{T}, \rho\} \subset Z$, $\forall \mathbb{U} \in Z \cap (St \cup \{\Omega\})[\mathbb{U}^\dagger \in Z]$, $\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(\zeta) \in Z$, and $\mathrm{MIH}(\zeta; Z)$. Then $\eta \in Z \subset \mathcal{W}$ follows from Lemma 7.34 and Proposition 7.35. □

Definition 7.37 For irreducible functions f let

$$f \in J :\Leftrightarrow SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{W}.$$

For $a \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ and irreducible functions f, define:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} A(\zeta, a, f) & :\Leftrightarrow & \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{W} \cap \mathbb{I}[\mathrm{g}_0^*(\psi_\sigma^f(a)) \leq \zeta \Rightarrow \psi_\sigma^f(a) \in \mathcal{W}]. \\ \mathrm{SIH}(\zeta, a) & :\Leftrightarrow & \forall b \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap a \forall f \in J\, A(\zeta, b, f). \\ \mathrm{SSIH}(\zeta, a, f) & :\Leftrightarrow & \forall g \in J[g <_{lx}^0 f \Rightarrow A(\zeta, a, g)]. \end{array}$$

Lemma 7.38 *For* each $\zeta \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})$, *the following holds:*

Assume $a \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap (\zeta + 1)$, $f \in J$, $\mathrm{SIH}(\zeta, a)$, $\mathrm{SSIH}(\zeta, a, f)$ *in Definition 7.37. Moreover assume* $\mathrm{MIH}(\zeta; \mathcal{W})$ *in Proposition 7.31. Then for any* $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{T}^\dagger \in SSt$ *with* $\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{W}$ *and any* $\kappa \in \mathcal{W} \cap (L(\mathbb{S}) \cup \{\mathbb{S}\})$ *the following holds:*

$$\mathrm{g}_0^*(\psi_\kappa^f(a)) \leq \zeta \Rightarrow \psi_\kappa^f(a) \in \mathcal{W}.$$

Proof. Let $\alpha_1 = \psi_\kappa^f(a) \in OT(\mathbb{I})$ with $a \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap (\zeta + 1)$, $\kappa \in \mathcal{W} \cap ((L(\mathbb{S}) \cup \{\mathbb{S}\})$ and $f \in J$ such that $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{T}^\dagger$ with $\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{W}$, and $\mathrm{g}_0^*(\alpha_1) \leq \zeta$. By Lemma 7.30 we have $\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(\zeta) \in \mathcal{W}$. By Lemma 7.34 and the assumption $\mathrm{MIH}(\zeta; \mathcal{W})$ it suffices to show $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{W}}$.

By Lemma 7.9 we have $\{\kappa, a\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W})$, and hence $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W})$. It suffices to show the following claim by induction on $\ell\beta_1$.

$$\forall \beta_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \alpha_1[\beta_1 \in \mathcal{W}]. \tag{54}$$

Proof of (54). Assume $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \alpha_1$ and let

$$\mathrm{LIH} :\Leftrightarrow \forall \gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \alpha_1[\ell\gamma < \ell\beta_1 \Rightarrow \gamma \in \mathcal{W}].$$

We show $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{W}$. We can assume $\beta_1 \notin \{0, \Omega\}$ by Proposition 7.22.
Case 1. $\beta_1 \notin \mathcal{E}(\beta_1)$: Assume $\beta_1 \notin \mathcal{W}$. Then $\beta_1 \neq \mathbb{I}[\rho], \rho^\dagger$ for any ρ by $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \alpha_1$ and Definition 7.1. $S(\beta_1) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \alpha_1$. LIH yields $S(\beta_1) \subset \mathcal{W}$. Hence we conclude $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{W}$ from Proposition 7.11.

In what follows consider the cases when $\beta_1 = \psi_\pi^g(b)$ for some π, b, g. We can assume $\pi > \alpha_1$ and $\{\pi, b\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W})$. Then either $\pi = \mathbb{I}$ or $\beta_1 \in L(\mathbb{S})$ for $\alpha_1 \in L(\mathbb{S})$.
Case 2. $\pi = \mathbb{I}$ and $b < a$: As in the proof of Lemma 7.30 we see $b \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})$.

We obtain $\beta_1 = \psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b) \in \mathcal{W}$ by $b < a \leq \zeta$ and Lemma 7.30.

Case 3. $\pi < \mathbb{I}$, $b < a$, $\beta_1 < \kappa$ and $\{\pi, b\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha_1)$: Then $\beta_1 \in L(\mathbb{S})$. Let B denote a set of subterms of β_1 defined recursively as follows. First $\{\pi, b\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \subset B$. Let $\alpha_1 \leq \beta \in B$. If $\beta =_{NF} \gamma_m + \cdots + \gamma_0$, then $\{\gamma_i : i \leq m\} \subset B$. If $\beta =_{NF} \varphi\gamma\delta$, then $\{\gamma, \delta\} \subset B$. If $\beta = \psi^h_\sigma(c)$, then $\{\sigma, c\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(h) \subset B$. If $\beta \in \{\mathbb{I}[\tau]\} \cup \{\tau^{\dagger k} : k > 0\}$, then $\tau \in B$.

Then from $\{\pi, b\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W})$ we see inductively that $B \subset \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha_1)$. Hence by LIH we obtain $B \cap \alpha_1 \subset \mathcal{W}$. Moreover if $\alpha_1 \leq \psi^h_\sigma(c) \in B$, then $c \in K_{\alpha_1}(\{\pi, b\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g)) < a$. We claim that

$$\forall \beta \in B(\beta \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})) \tag{55}$$

Proof of (55) by induction on $\ell\beta$. Let $\beta \in B$. We may assume that $\alpha_1 \leq \beta$ is a strongly critical number such that $\beta \notin \{\Omega, \mathbb{I}\} \cup SSt$ by induction hypothesis on the lengths. First consider the case when $\alpha_1 \leq \beta = \psi^h_\sigma(c)$. By induction hypothesis we have $\{\sigma, c\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(h) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})$. On the other hand we have $c < a$ and $\mathfrak{g}^*_0(\beta) \leq \mathfrak{g}^*_0(\alpha_1)$ by Proposition 6.14. SIH(ζ, a) yields $\beta \in \mathcal{W}$.

Second let $\alpha_1 \leq \beta \in \{\mathbb{I}[\tau]\} \cup \{\tau^{\dagger k} : k > 0\}$ for a $\tau \in L(\mathbb{S})$. By IH we obtain $\tau \in \mathcal{W}$. We claim that $\mathfrak{g}^*_0(\tau) \leq \mathfrak{g}^*_0(\alpha_1) \leq \zeta$. If $\tau \leq \alpha_1$, then we obtain $\mathfrak{g}^*_0(\tau) = \mathfrak{g}^*_0(\alpha_1)$. Otherwise $\alpha_1 < \tau = \psi^h_\sigma(c) \in B \subset \mathcal{H}_a(\alpha_1)$ for some σ, h, c. We obtain $\mathfrak{g}^*_0(\tau) \leq \mathfrak{g}^*_0(\alpha_1)$ by Proposition 6.14. On the other hand we have $\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{W}$ by one of the assumptions. Corollary 7.36 yields $\beta \in \mathcal{W}$.

Thus (55) is shown. □

In particular we obtain $\{\pi, b\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \subset \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})$. Moreover we have $b < a$ and $\mathfrak{g}^*_0(\beta_1) \leq \mathfrak{g}^*_0(\alpha_1)$ by Proposition 6.10.

Therefore once again SIH(ζ, a) yields $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{W}$.

Case 4. $b = a$, $\pi = \kappa < \mathbb{I}$, $\forall \delta \in SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g)(K_{\alpha_1}(\delta) < a)$ and $g <^0_{lx} f$: Obviously $\mathfrak{g}^*_0(\beta_1) = \mathfrak{g}^*_0(\alpha_1)$. As in (55) we see that $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(g) \subset \mathcal{W}$ from SIH(ζ, a). SSIH(ζ, a, f) yields $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{W}$.

Case 5. $a \leq b \leq K_{\beta_1}(\delta)$ for some $\delta \in SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \cup \{\kappa, a\}$: It suffices to find a γ such that $\beta_1 \leq \gamma \in \mathcal{W} \cap \alpha_1$. Then $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{W}$ follows from $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{W})$ and Propositions 7.2.1 and 7.10.

$k_X(\alpha)$ denotes the set in Definition 6.15. In general we see that $a \in K_X(\alpha)$ iff $\psi^h_\sigma(a) \in k_X(\alpha)$ for some σ, h, and for each $\psi^h_\sigma(a) \in k_X(\psi^{h_0}_{\sigma_0}(a_0))$ there exists a sequence $\{\alpha_i\}_{i \leq m}$ of subterms of $\alpha_0 = \psi^{h_0}_{\sigma_0}(a_0)$ such that $\alpha_m = \psi^h_\sigma(a)$, $\alpha_i = \psi^{h_i}_{\sigma_i}(a_i)$ for some σ_i, a_i, h_i, and for each $i < m$, $X \not\ni \alpha_{i+1} \in \mathcal{E}(C_i)$ for $C_i = \{\sigma_i, a_i\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(h_i)$.

Let $\delta \in SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f) \cup \{\kappa, a\}$ such that $b \leq \gamma$ for a $\gamma \in K_{\beta_1}(\delta)$. Pick an $\alpha_2 = \psi^{h_2}_{\sigma_2}(a_2) \in \mathcal{E}(\delta)$ such that $\gamma \in K_{\beta_1}(\alpha_2)$, and an $\alpha_m = \psi^{h_m}_{\sigma_m}(a_m) \in k_{\beta_1}(\alpha_2)$ for some σ_m, h_m and $a_m \geq b \geq a$. We have $\alpha_2 \in \mathcal{W}$ by $\delta \in \mathcal{W}$. If $\alpha_2 < \alpha_1$, then $\beta_1 \leq \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{W} \cap \alpha_1$, and we are done. Assume $\alpha_2 \geq \alpha_1$, i.e., $\alpha_2 \notin \alpha_1$. Then $a_2 \in K_{\alpha_1}(\alpha_2) < a \leq b$, and $m > 2$.

Let $\{\alpha_i\}_{2 \leq i \leq m}$ be the sequence of subterms of α_2 such that $\alpha_i = \psi^{h_i}_{\sigma_i}(a_i)$ for some σ_i, a_i, h_i, and for each $i < m$, $\beta_1 \leq \alpha_{i+1} \in \mathcal{E}(C_i)$ for $C_i = \{\sigma_i, a_i\} \cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(h_i)$.

Let $\{n_j\}_{0\leq j\leq k}\,(0<k\leq m-2)$ be the increasing sequence $n_0<n_1<\cdots<n_k\leq m$ defined recursively by $n_0=2$, and assuming n_j has been defined so that $n_j<m$ and $\alpha_{n_j}\geq\alpha_1$, n_{j+1} is defined by $n_{j+1}=\min(\{i:n_j<i<m:\alpha_i<\alpha_{n_j}\}\cup\{m\})$. If either $n_j=m$ or $\alpha_{n_j}<\alpha_1$, then $k=j$ and n_{j+1} is undefined. Then we claim that

$$\forall j\leq k(\alpha_{n_j}\in\mathcal{W})\,\&\,\alpha_{n_k}<\alpha_1 \tag{56}$$

Proof of (56). By induction on $j\leq k$ we show first that $\forall j\leq k(\alpha_{n_j}\in\mathcal{W})$. We have $\alpha_{n_0}=\alpha_2\in\mathcal{W}$. Assume $\alpha_{n_j}\in\mathcal{W}$ and $j<k$. Then $n_j<m$, i.e., $\alpha_{n_{j+1}}<\alpha_{n_j}$, and by $\alpha_{n_j}\in\mathcal{C}^{\alpha_{n_j}}(\mathcal{W})$, we have $C_{n_j}\subset\mathcal{C}^{\alpha_{n_j}}(\mathcal{W})$, and hence $\alpha_{n_j+1}\in\mathcal{E}(C_{n_j})\subset\mathcal{C}^{\alpha_{n_j}}(\mathcal{W})$. We see inductively that $\alpha_i\in\mathcal{C}^{\alpha_{n_j}}(\mathcal{W})$ for any i with $n_j\leq i\leq n_{j+1}$. Therefore $\alpha_{n_{j+1}}\in\mathcal{C}^{\alpha_{n_j}}(\mathcal{W})\cap\alpha_{n_j}\subset\mathcal{W}$ by Propositions 7.2.1 and 7.10.

Next we show that $\alpha_{n_k}<\alpha_1$. We can assume that $n_k=m$. This means that $\forall i(n_{k-1}\leq i<m\Rightarrow\alpha_i\geq\alpha_{n_{k-1}})$. We have $\alpha_2=\alpha_{n_0}>\alpha_{n_1}>\cdots>\alpha_{n_{k-1}}\geq\alpha_1$, and $\forall i<m(\alpha_i\geq\alpha_1)$. Therefore $\alpha_m\in k_{\alpha_1}(\alpha_2)\subset k_{\alpha_1}(\{\kappa,a\}\cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(h))$, i.e., $a_m\in K_{\alpha_1}(\{\kappa,a\}\cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(h))$ for $\alpha_m=\psi^{h_m}_{\sigma_m}(a_m)$. On the other hand we have $K_{\alpha_1}(\{\kappa,a\}\cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(h))<a$ for $\alpha_1=\psi^h_\sigma(a)$. Thus $a\leq a_m<a$, a contradiction.

(56) is shown, and we obtain $\beta_1\leq\alpha_{n_k}\in\mathcal{W}\cap\alpha_1$.

This completes a proof of (54) and of the lemma. □

Corollary 7.39 *For* each $\zeta\in\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})$, $\mathrm{MIH}(\zeta;\mathcal{W})$ *holds.*

Proof. For each $n<\omega$, we have $TI[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})\cap\omega_n(\mathbb{I}+1)]$ by Lemma 7.13.2. We show $\mathrm{MIH}(\zeta;\mathcal{W})$ by induction on $\zeta\in\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})$. Assume $\forall\xi\in\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})\cap\zeta\,\mathrm{MIH}(\xi;\mathcal{W})$.

Let $\mathbb{S}=\mathbb{T}^\dagger$ with $\mathbb{T}\in\mathcal{W}$, and $\gamma=\psi^f_\kappa(a)\in L(\mathbb{S})$ be such that $k(\gamma)=\{\kappa,a\}\cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)\subset\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})$ and $\xi=\mathtt{h}(\gamma)=\{a,\mathtt{g}^*_0(\gamma)\}\subset\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})\cap\zeta$. We obtain $\mathrm{MIH}(\xi;\mathcal{W})$ by IH.

Then we obtain $\gamma\in\mathcal{W}$ by Lemma 7.38 and $\mathrm{MIH}(\xi;\mathcal{W})$ with subsidiary induction on $a\in\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})\cap(\xi+1)$ and sub-subsidiary induction on $f\in J$. Then Corollary 7.36 yields $\{\mathbb{I}[\gamma]\}\cup\{\gamma^{\dagger k}:k>0\}\subset\mathcal{W}$.

Here by induction on $f\in J$ we mean by induction along $g<^0_{lx}f$. In the proof of Lemma 7.38, $\mathrm{SSIH}(\zeta,a,f)$ is invoked in **Case 4**, i.e., only when $\psi^g_\kappa(a)<\psi^f_\kappa(a)$ with $\kappa<\mathbb{I}$. Then Lemma 6.3 yields $o_{\mathbb{I}}(g)<o_{\mathbb{I}}(f)\in\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})$ for $SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)\subset\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})\cap\Lambda$, where $\Lambda=\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(b)$ and $b=\mathtt{g}^*_0(\psi^f_\kappa(a))\geq\mathtt{p}_0(\psi^f_\kappa(a))$. Hence $o_\Lambda(g)<o_\Lambda(f)\in\mathcal{W}$ by $\Lambda\in\mathcal{W}$. □

Lemma 7.40 *For* each $n<\omega$, *the following holds:*

If one of the followings holds, then $\alpha\in\mathcal{W}$ for $\alpha\in OT(\mathbb{I})$.

1. $\alpha=\mathbb{S}^\dagger$ *with* $\mathbb{S}\in\mathcal{W}\cap(St\cup\{\Omega\})$.
2. $\alpha=\psi_{\mathbb{I}}(a)$ *with* $a\in\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})\cap\omega_n(\mathbb{I}+1)$.
3. $\alpha=\psi^f_\kappa(a)\in L(\mathbb{S})$ *for* $\mathbb{S}=\mathbb{T}^\dagger$ *with* $\mathbb{T}\in\mathcal{W}$ *and* $k(\alpha)\cup\mathtt{h}(\alpha)=\{\kappa,a,\mathtt{g}^*_0(\alpha)\}\cup SC_{\mathbb{I}}(f)\subset\mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})\cap\omega_n(\mathbb{I}+1)$.

4. $\alpha = \mathbb{I}[\rho] < \mathbb{I}$ *for* $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{T}^\dagger$ *with* $\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{W}$, $\rho \in \mathcal{W} \cap L(\mathbb{S})$ *and* $\mathfrak{g}^*_0(\rho) < \omega_n(\mathbb{I}+1)$.

5. $\alpha = \rho^\dagger$ *for* $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{T}^\dagger$ *with* $\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{W}$, $\rho \in \mathcal{W} \cap L(\mathbb{S})$ *and* $\mathfrak{g}^*_0(\rho) < \omega_n(\mathbb{I}+1)$.

Proof. 7.40.1 is seen from Lemma 7.21.
7.40.2 follows from Lemma 7.30.
7.40.3 follows from Corollary 7.39.
7.40.4 and 7.40.5 follow from Corollaries 7.36 and 7.39. □

Let us conclude Theorem 1.2. For each $\alpha \in OT(\mathbb{I})$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W})$ is seen by metainduction on the lengths $\ell\alpha$ using Propositions 7.11, 7.22 and Lemma 7.40. Note that $\ell(\mathfrak{g}^*_0(\psi^f_\kappa(a))) < \ell(\psi^f_\kappa(a))$ and $\ell(\mathbb{T}) < \ell(\rho)$ for $\rho \in L(\mathbb{S})$ and $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{T}^\dagger$. Therefore we obtain Σ^1_3-DC+BI $\vdash \alpha \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathcal{W}) \cap \Omega = \mathcal{W} \cap \Omega = W(\mathcal{C}^0(\mathcal{W})) \cap \Omega = W(OT(\mathbb{I})) \cap \Omega$, and Σ^1_3-DC+BI $\vdash Wo[\alpha]$ for each $\alpha < \psi_\Omega(\varepsilon_{\mathbb{I}+1})$.

References

[1] T. Arai, Wellfoundedness proof with the maximal distinguished set, *Arch. Math. Logic* **62** (2023), 333-357.

[2] T. Arai, An ordinal analysis of a single stable ordinal, submitted.

[3] J. Barwise, Admissible Sets and Structures (Springer, Berlin, 1975).

[4] W. Buchholz, Normalfunktionen und konstruktive Systeme von Ordinalzahlen. In: Diller, J., Müller, G. H. (eds.) Proof Theory Symposion Keil 1974, Lect. Notes Math. vol. 500, pp. 4-25, Springer (1975)

[5] W. Buchholz, A simplified version of local predicativity, in *Proof Theory*, eds. P. H. G. Aczel, H. Simmons and S. S. Wainer (Cambridge UP,1992), pp. 115–147.

[6] F. Drake, Set Theory: An Introduction to Large Cardinals (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1974).

[7] P. G. Hinman, Recursion-Theoretic Hierarchies (Springer, Berlin, 1978).

[8] G. Jäger, A well-ordering proof for Feferman's theory T, Archiv f. math. Logik u. Grundl., 23(1983), 65-77.

[9] G. Jäger, Theories for admissible sets, A unifying approach to proof theory, Studies in Proof Theory Lecture Notes 2 (Bibliopolis, Napoli, 1986).

[10] M. Rathjen, An ordinal analysis of parameter free Π^1_2-comprehension, *Arch. Math. Logic* **44** (2005) 263-362.

[11] S. Simpson, Subsystems of Second Order Arithmetic, second edition, 2009, Cambridge UP.